arXiv:1603.06104v2 [math.DS] 31 Mar 2016

CONTINUITY OF ATTRACTORS FOR A FAMILY OF $\mathcal{C}^1$ PERTURBATIONS OF THE SQUARE

PRICILA S. BARBOSA*, ANTÔNIO L. PEREIRA$^\diamond$ AND MARCONE C. PEREIRA†

Abstract. We consider here the family of semilinear parabolic problems

$$\begin{cases} u_t(x,t) &= \Delta u(x,t) - au(x,t) + f(u(x,t)), \quad x \in \Omega_\epsilon \text{ and } \quad t>0\,, \\ \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial N}(x,t) &= g(u(x,t)),\ x \in \partial\Omega_\epsilon \text{ and } \quad t>0\,, \end{cases}$$

where Ω is the unit square, $\Omega_\epsilon = h_\epsilon(\Omega)$ and h_ϵ is a family of diffeomorphisms converging to the identity in the C^1-norm. We show that the problem is well posed for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small in a suitable phase space, the associated semigroup has a global attractor $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ and the family $\{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon\}$ is continuous at $\epsilon = 0$.

1. Introduction

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the unit square, a a positive number $f, g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ real functions, and consider the family of semilinear parabolic problems with nonlinear Neumann boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} u_t(x,t) &= \Delta u(x,t) - au(x,t) + f(u(x,t)), \quad x \in \Omega_\epsilon \text{ and } \quad t>0\,, \\ \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial N}(x,t) &= g(u(x,t)),\ x \in \partial\Omega_\epsilon \text{ and } \quad t>0\,, \end{cases} \tag{P_ϵ}$$

where $\Omega_\epsilon = h_\epsilon(\Omega)$ and h_ϵ is the family of diffeomorphisms, given by

$$h_\epsilon(x_1, x_2) = (\, x_1\,,\, x_2 + x_2\,\epsilon\, sen(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)\,) \tag{1}$$

with $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small (see figure (1)).

Our aim here is to prove well-posedness, establish the existence of a global attractor $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ for sufficiently small ϵ and prove the continuity of the family of attractors at $\epsilon = 0$, under appropriate conditions on the nonlinearities.

It well known that, under some smoothness hypotheses on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, f and g, the problem is well posed in appropriate phase spaces. The existence of a global compact attractor has been proved in [4] and [10], under some additional growth and dissipative conditions on the nonlinearities f and g. In [12] the authors prove the continuity of the attractors with respect to C^2 perturbations of a smooth domain of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 35B41; Secondary: 35K20, 58D25.

Key words and phrases. parabolic problem, perturbation of the domain, Lipschitz domain, global attractor, continuity of attractors.

*Partially supported by CNPq-Brazil grant 142278/2010-6 and 233524/2014-2.

$^\diamond$Partially supported by CNPq-Brazil grant 141882/2003-4.

†Partially supported by CNPq-Brazil grant 302960/2014-7 and 471210/2013-7, FAPESP 2013/22275-1.



FIGURE 1. Map h_ϵ.

These results do not extend immediately to the case considered here, due to the lack of smoothness of the domains considered and the fact that the perturbations do not converge to the inclusion in the C^2 norm.

The problem of existence and continuity of global attractors for semilinear parabolic problems, with respect to change of domains has also been considered in [3], for the problem with homogeneous boundary condition

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u + f(x,u) \ \text{ in } \quad \Omega_\epsilon \\ \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial N} = 0 \ \text{ on } \quad \partial\Omega_\epsilon\,, \end{cases}$$

where Ω_ϵ, $0 \le \epsilon \le \epsilon_0$ are bounded domains with Lipschitz boundary in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \ge 2$. They prove that, if the perturbations are such that the convergence of the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the linear part of the problem can be shown, than the upper semicontinuity of attractors follow. With the additional assumption that the equilibria are all hyperbolic, the lower semicontinuity is also obtained.

The behavior of the equilibria of (P_ϵ) was studied in [1] and [2]. In these papers, the authors consider a family of smooth domains $\Omega_\epsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \ge 2$ and $0 \le \epsilon \le \epsilon_0$ whose boundary oscillates rapidly when the parameter $\epsilon \to 0$ and prove that the solutions, as well as the spectra of the linearised problem around them, converge to the solution of a "limit problem".

In this work, we follow the general approach of [12], which consists basically in "pull-backing" the perturbed problems to the fixed domain Ω and then considering the family of abstract semilinear problems thus generated.

We observe that the results obtained can be easily extended to *convex* domains, and more general families of C^1 perturbations, but we have chosen to consider a specific setting, for the sake of clarity. The extension to more general Lipschitz domains is problematic for the lack of appropriate regularity results.

The paper is organized as follows: in section 1 we collect some results needed later. In section 2 we show how the problem can be reduced to a family of problems in the initial domain and, in section 3, we show that the perturbed linear operators are sectorial operators in suitable spaces. In section 4 we show that the problem can be reformulated as an abstract problem in a scale of Banach spaces which are shown to be locally well-posed in section 5, under suitable growth assumptions onf f and g. In section 6, assuming a dissipative

condition for the problem, using the properties of a Lyapunov functional, we prove that the solutions are globally defined. In section 7 we prove the existence of global attractors. Finally, in section 8, we show first that these attractors behave upper semicontinuosly and, with some additional properties on the nonlinearities and on the set of equilibria, we show that they are also lower semicontinuos at $\epsilon = 0$ in the H^s-norm for $s < 1$.

Preliminaries

We collect here some definitions and results that will be used in the sequel.

1.1. **Boundary perturbation.** One of the difficulties encountered in problems of perturbation of the domain is that the function spaces change with the change of the region. One way to overcome this difficulty is to effect a "change of variables" in order to bring the problem back to a fixed region. This approach was developed by D. Henry in [7] and is the one we adopt here.

If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded region, we denote by $Diff^m(\Omega), m \geq 0$, the set of $\mathcal{C}^m$ embeddings (=diffeomorphisms from Ω to its image).

If $h \in Diff^m(\Omega)$, we may define the "pull-back" map $h^* : C^m(h(\Omega)) \to C^m(\Omega)$ by

$$h^*u(x) = (u \circ h)(x) = u(h(x)), x \in \Omega.$$

Proposition 1.1. *The map*

$$\begin{array}{rccc} h^* : & C^m(h(\Omega)) & \to & C^m(\Omega) \\ & u & \longmapsto & u \circ h \end{array}$$

is an isomorphism, with inverse $h^{*-1} = (h^{-1})^*$*, for* $m \geq 0$.

Proof. See [7]. □

It is important to observe that the above result is also true in other function (e.g. Sobolev) spaces. (see Lemma 2.3).

If L is a (formal) constant matrix coefficient differential operator

$$Lu(x) = \left(u(x), \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(x), \cdots, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_n}(x), \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_1^2}(x), \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2}(x), \cdots \right), \ x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

with values in $\mathbb{R}^k$ and $f(x, \lambda)$ is a function defined for (x, λ) in some open set $O \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^k$, we may define the nonlinear differential operator F_Ω, by

$$F_\Omega(u)(x) = f(x, Lu(x)), x \in \Omega,$$

for sufficiently smooth functions u defined in Ω such that $(x, Lu(x)) \in O$, for any $x \in \overline{\Omega}$.

If $h : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n \in Diff^m(\Omega)$ we may consider the differential operator $F_{h(\Omega)}$ with $D(F_{h(\Omega)}) \subset C^m(h(\Omega))$, open. The map

$$F_{h(\Omega)} : D(F_{h(\Omega)}) \subset C^m(h(\Omega)) \to C^0(h(\Omega))$$

is the *Eulerian* form of the formal nonlinear differential operator $v \longmapsto f(\cdot, Lv(\cdot))$ on $h(\Omega)$, whereas

$$h^* F_{h(\Omega)} h^{*-1} : h^* D(F_{h(\Omega)}) \subset C^m(\Omega) \to C^0(\Omega)$$

is the *Lagrangian* form of the same operator. The same notation is used in other function spaces.

The *Eulerian* form is frequently more natural and simpler for computations, but the *Lagrangian* form is more adequate to prove theorems, since it allow us to work in fixed function spaces. However, to use standard tools such as the implicit function theorem, we need to show that the map

$$(u,h) \longmapsto h^* F_{h(\Omega)} h^{*-1} u$$

is smooth and compute its derivatives. The differentiability with respect to u poses no problem, since h^* is linear. The differentiability with respect to h, is the content of the next result.

Proposition 1.2. *Let $Diff^m(\Omega)$ denote the open subset of maps in $\mathcal{C}^m(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ which are diffeomorphisms to their images (=embeddings). Then the map*

$$(u,h) \to (h^* L h^{*-1})u : Diff^m(\Omega) \times \mathcal{C}^m(\Omega) \to \mathcal{C}^0(\Omega)$$

is analytic. If, in addition f is $\mathcal{C}^k$ or analytic, then

$$(u,h) \to h^* F_{h(\Omega)} h^{*-1} u : Diff^m(\Omega) \times \mathcal{C}^m(\Omega) \to \mathcal{C}^0(\Omega)$$

is $\mathcal{C}^k$ or analytic, respectively.

Proof. See [7]. □

1.2. **Lipschitz domains and fractional Sobolev spaces.**

Definition 1.3. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set. We say that $\overline{\Omega}$ is a Lipschitz domain (resp.continuously differentiable, of class $\mathbb{C}^{k,1}$ ($k \geq 1$), m-times continuously differentiable) if, for any $x \in \partial\Omega$, there exists a neighborhood V of x in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and a map $\psi : V \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

(a) *ψ is injective;*
(b) *ψ and ψ^{-1} (defined in $\psi(V)$) are Lipschitz maps (resp.continuously differentiable, of class $\mathbb{C}^{k,1}$ ($k \geq 1$), m-times continuously differentiable);*
(c) *$\Omega \cap V = \left\{ y \in \Omega \;\middle|\; \psi_n(y) < 0 \right\}$, where $\psi_n(y)$ denotes the n-th component of $\psi(y)$.*

We now define the (fractional) Sobolev spaces $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ in open sets Ω of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Definition 1.4. *If Ω is an open set of $\mathbb{R}^n$, the Sobolev space $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ is the set of all distributions u in Ω such that*

(a) *$D^\alpha u \in L^p(\Omega)$, for $|\,\alpha\,| \leq m$, when $s = m$ is a non-negative integer;*
(b) *$u \in W^{m,p}(\Omega)$ and*

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\, D^\alpha u(x) - D^\alpha u(y)\,|^p}{|\, x - y\,|^{n+\sigma p}} dx\, dy < +\infty$$

for $|\,\alpha\,| = m$, when $s = m + \sigma$ is non-negative and non-integer.

We define a norm in $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ *by*

$$|| u ||_{W^{m,p}(\Omega)} = \left\{ \sum_{| \alpha | \leq m} \int_{\Omega} | D^{\alpha} u |^{p} dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

in case (a), and by

$$|| u ||_{W^{s,p}(\Omega)} = \left\{ || u ||^{p}_{W^{m,p}(\Omega)} + \sum_{| \alpha | = m} \int\int_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{| D^{\alpha} u(x) - D^{\alpha} u(y) |^{p}}{| x - y |^{n + \sigma p}} dx\, dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

in case (b).

In what follows, we indicate by $X \hookrightarrow Y$, the continuous inclusion of the space X into Y.

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ *in an open bounded domain. If* $p \geq 1$, $kp < 2$ *and* $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{k}{2}$ *then* $W^{k,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{q}(\Omega)$. *If* $p \geq 1$, $kp = 2$, *then* $W^{k,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{q}(\Omega)$ *for all* q, $1 \leq q < \infty$.

Proof. See [9], pg 66. □

Theorem 1.6. *Suppose* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ *an open bounded domain. Suppose* $p \geq 1$, $kp > 2$, *and put*

$$\mu \begin{cases} = k - \frac{2}{p} & \text{if } \; k - \frac{2}{p} < 1\,, \\ < 1 & \text{if } \; k - \frac{2}{p} = 1\,, \\ = 1 & \text{if } \; k - \frac{2}{p} > 1. \end{cases}$$

Then $W^{k,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow C^{0,\mu}(\overline{\Omega})$.

Proof. See [9], pg 66. □

Theorem 1.7. *If* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ *is a bounded Lipschitz domain and* $s > t \geq 0$, *then the inclusion* $I : W^{s,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{t,p}(\Omega)$ *is compact.*

See [5], pg 26.

Theorem 1.8. *Let* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *be an open bounded domain of class* $C^{k,1}$, $k \geq 0$. *If* $s - 1/p$ *is non integer,* $s \leq k + 1$, $s - 1/p = l + \sigma$, $0 < \sigma < 1$, $l \geq 0$ *integer, then the trace map*

$$u \longmapsto \left\{ \gamma u, \gamma \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}, ..., \gamma \frac{\partial^{l} u}{\partial \nu^{l}} \right\}$$

which is defined for $u \in C^{k,1}(\overline{\Omega})$, *has a unique continuous extension as a map*

$$W^{s,p}(\Omega) \;\; to \;\; \prod_{j=0}^{l} W^{s-j-1/p\,,\,p}(\partial\Omega).$$

See [5], pg 37.

Theorem 1.9. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open bounded Lipschitz domain. Then, the trace map $u \to \gamma u$ which is defined for $u \in C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega})$, has a unique continuous extension as a map from $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ to $W^{1-1/p\,,p}(\partial\Omega)$.*

See [5], pg 38.

Theorem 1.10. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be an open bounded Lipschitz domain $0 \leq k < 1$ and $q = \dfrac{1}{1-k}$. Then the trace map $u \to \gamma u$ which is defined for $u \in C^{\infty}(\overline{\Omega})$, has a unique continuous extension as a map from $H^k(\Omega)$ to $L^q(\partial\Omega)$.*

Proof. See [9], pg 81. □

Theorem 1.11. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a Lipschitz domain, $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $v \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$, where $\dfrac{1}{p} + \dfrac{1}{q} \leq \dfrac{N+1}{N}$ if $N > p \geq 1$, $N > q \geq 1$ with $q > 1$ if $p \geq N$ and $p > 1$ if $q \geq N$. Then*

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} v \, dx = \int_{\partial\Omega} uv\nu_i \, dS - \int_\Omega u \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i} dx \,,$$

where $(\nu_1, \cdots, \nu_N)$ is the outward unit normal, defined a.e.

Proof. See [9], pg 117. □

When dealing with Lipschitz domains, we face some difficulties concerning the regularity of solutions for elliptic problems (see [5] for details). An appropriate result for our needs is available in the case of *convex* domains for *strongly elliptic* operators in the divergence form, defined as follows:

Definition 1.12. *A second order differential operator L in the domain Ω in the divergence form $Lu = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} D_i \left(a_{i,j} D_j u\right)$ where $a_{i,j}$ are* real *constants satisfying $a_{i,j} = a_{j,i} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega})$ is* strongly elliptic *if there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$, such that $-\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{i,j}(x)\xi_i\xi_j \geq \alpha|\xi|^2$ for any $\xi = (\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $x \in \overline{\Omega}$.*

Remark 1.13. *Since $a_{i,j} = a_{j,i}$, we also have $-\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{i,j}(x)\xi_i\xi_j \geq \alpha\left(|Re\,\xi|^2 + |Im\,\xi|^2\right) = \alpha|\xi|^2$ for any $\xi = (\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$, if L is strongly elliptic.*

(For example: $-\Delta u$ is strongly elliptic.)

Theorem 1.14. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open bounded and convex domain and $Lu = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} D_i \left(a_{i,j} D_j u\right)$ a strongly elliptic operator in the divergence form. Then, for any $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $\lambda > 0$, there exists a unique $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ such that*

$$-\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \int_\Omega a_{i,j} D_i u D_j v \, dx \, + \, \lambda \int_\Omega uv \, dx \, = \, \int_\Omega fv \, dx \,,$$

for any $v \in H^1(\Omega)$.

Proof. See [5], pg 149. □

1.3. **Sectorial operators and semilinear abstract problems.** The results in this section were taken from [12] and [8], where more details and proofs can be found.

Definition 1.15. *A linear operator* A *in a Banach space* X *is called* sectorial *if it is closed, densely defined and there exists* $\theta \in \left(0\,,\,\frac{\pi}{2}\right)$, $M \geq 1$ *and* $a \in \mathbb{R}$, *such that the sector*

$$S_{a\,,\theta} = \left\{\, \lambda \,\middle|\, \theta \leq |\, arg(\lambda - a)\,| \leq \pi,\ \lambda \neq a \,\right\}$$

is in the resolvent set of A, *and*

$$||\,(\,\lambda - A\,)^{-1}|| \leq \frac{M}{|\,\lambda - a\,|}\,, \quad \textit{for all} \ \ \lambda \in S_{a\,,\theta}.$$

Definition 1.16. *If* A *is a sectorial operator with* $Re\,\sigma(A) > 0$ *then, for any* $\alpha > 0$ *we define the fractional power* $A^{-\alpha}$ *of* A, *by*

$$A^{-\alpha} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty t^{\,\alpha-1} e^{-At} dt.$$

Theorem 1.17. *If* A *is a sectorial operator in* X *with* $Re\,\sigma(A) > 0$, *then for any* $\alpha > 0$, $A^{-\alpha}$ *is a bounded linear operator on* X *which is injective and satisfies* $A^{-\alpha}A^{-\beta} = A^{-(\alpha+\beta)}$, *when* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $\beta > 0$. *Furthermore, for* $0 < \alpha < 1$

$$A^{-\alpha} = \frac{\sin \pi\alpha}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \lambda^{-\alpha}(\lambda + A)^{-1} d\lambda.$$

Proof. See [8] , pg 25. □

Definition 1.18. *If* A *is as in Theorem 1.17, we define* A^α *as the inverse of* $A^{-\alpha}$ $(\alpha > 0)$ *and* $D(A^\alpha) = R(A^{-\alpha})$, *where* $D(A^\alpha)$ *is the domain of* A^α *and* $R(A^{-\alpha})$ *is the range of* $A^{-\alpha}$.

Definition 1.19. *If* A *is a sectorial operator in a Banach space* X, *we define, for* $\alpha \geq 0$

$$X^\alpha = D(A_1^\alpha) \ \textit{ with the graph norm}\,,$$

$$||\,x\,||_\alpha = ||\,A_1^\alpha x\,||\,,\ x \in X^\alpha\,,$$

where $A_1 = A + aI$ *with* a *such that* $Re\,\sigma(A_1) > 0$.

Theorem 1.20. *If* A *is a sectorial operator in a Banach space* X, *then* X^α *is a Banach space with norm* $||\cdot||_\alpha$ *for* $\alpha \geq 0$, $X^0 = X$ *and, for* $\alpha \geq \beta \geq 0$, X^α *is a dense subspace of* X^β *with continuous inclusion. If* A *has compact resolvent, the inclusion* $X^\alpha \subset X^\beta$ *is compact when* $\alpha > \beta \geq 0$.

Proof. See [8] , pg 29. □

Theorem 1.21. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a Lipschitz domain, $1 < p < \infty$ and A a sectorial operator in $X = L^p(\Omega)$ with $D(A) = X^1 \subset W^{m,p}(\Omega)$ for some $m \geq 1$. Then, for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$*

$$X^\alpha \subset W^{k,q}(\Omega) \quad when \quad k - \frac{n}{q} < m\alpha - \frac{n}{p}, \quad q \geq p,$$

$$X^\alpha \subset C^\nu(\Omega) \quad when \quad 0 \leq \nu < m\alpha - \frac{n}{p}.$$

Proof. See [8] pg 39. □

Lemma 1.22. *Suppose A is a sectorial operator with $\|(\lambda - A)^{-1}\| \leq \dfrac{M}{|\lambda - a|}$ for all λ in the sector $S_{a,\phi_0} = \{\lambda \mid \phi_0 \leq |arg(\lambda - a)| \leq \pi, \lambda \neq a\}$, for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 \leq \phi_0 < \pi/2$. Suppose also that B is a linear operator with $D(B) \supset D(A)$ and $\|Bx - Ax\| \leq \varepsilon\|Ax\| + K\|x\|$, for any $x \in D(A)$, where K and ε are positive constants with $\varepsilon \leq \dfrac{1}{4(1+LM)}$, $K \leq \dfrac{\sqrt{5}}{20M}\dfrac{\sqrt{2}L - 1}{L^2 - 1}$, for some $L > 1$.*

Then B is also sectorial. More precisely, if $b = \dfrac{L^2}{L^2-1}a - \dfrac{\sqrt{2}L}{L^2-1}|a|$, $\phi = \max\left\{\phi_0, \dfrac{\pi}{4}\right\}$ and $M' = 2M\sqrt{5}$ then

$$\|(\lambda - B)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{M'}{|\lambda - b|},$$

in the sector $S_{b,\phi} = \{\lambda \mid \phi \leq |arg(\lambda - b)| \leq \pi, \lambda \neq b\}$.

Proof. See [12], pg 348. □

Theorem 1.23. *Suppose that A is as in Lemma 1.22, Λ a topological space and $\{A_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Lambda}$ is a family of operators in X with $A_{\gamma_0} = A$ satisfying the following conditions:*

1. *$D(A_\gamma) \supset D(A)$, for all $\gamma \in \Lambda$;*
2. *$\|A_\gamma x - Ax\| \leq \epsilon(\gamma)\|Ax\| + K(\gamma)\|x\|$ for any $x \in D(A)$, where $K(\gamma)$ and $\epsilon(\gamma)$ are positive functions with $\lim\limits_{\gamma \to \gamma_0} \epsilon(\gamma) = 0$ and $\lim\limits_{\gamma \to \gamma_0} K(\gamma) = 0$.*

Then, there exists a neighborhood V of γ_0 such that A_γ is sectorial if $\gamma \in V$ and the family of (linear) semigroups e^{-tA_γ} satisfies

$$\|e^{-tA_\gamma} - e^{-tA}\| \leq C(\gamma)e^{-bt}$$

$$\|A\left(e^{-tA_\gamma} - e^{-tA}\right)\| \leq C(\gamma)\frac{1}{t}e^{-bt}$$

$$\|A^\alpha\left(e^{-tA_\gamma} - e^{-tA}\right)\| \leq C(\gamma)\frac{1}{t^\alpha}e^{-bt}, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1$$

for $t > 0$, where b is as in Lemma 1.22 and $C(\gamma) \to 0$ as $\gamma \to \gamma_0$.

Proof. See [12], pg 349. □

Consider now the abstract evolution equation

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{dx}{dt} + Ax = f(t,x)\,,\ t > t_0\,, \\ x(t_0) = x_0 \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where A is a sectorial operator in X and $f : U \subset \mathbb{R} \times X^\alpha \to X$, for some $\alpha \in [0,1)$.

Definition 1.24. *A solution of (2) in $[t_0, t_1)$ is a continuous function $x : [t_0, t_1) \to X^\alpha$, $x(t_0) = x_0$, such that $f(\cdot, x(\cdot)) : [t_0, t_1) \to X$ is continuous and for $t \in (t_0, t_1)$ $\dfrac{dx}{dt}$ exists, $(t, x(t)) \in U$, $x(t) \in D(A)$, and x satisfies (2).*

Theorem 1.25. *Suppose A is a sectorial operator, $0 \le \alpha < 1$, $U \subset \mathbb{R} \times X^\alpha$ is open and $f : U \to X$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in x, and locally Hölder continuous in t. Then, for any $(t_0, x_0) \in U$ there exists $T = T(t_0, x_0) > 0$ such that (2) has a unique solution $x(t; t_0, x_0)$ on $(t_0, t_0 + T)$ with initial value $x(t_0) = x_0$, which is continuous in x_0.*

Proof. See [8], Theorems 3.3.3 and 3.4.1. □

Theorem 1.26. *Suppose A and f satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 1.25 and also that $f(B)$ is bounded in X, for any closed bounded set $B \subset U$. Then, if x is a solution of (2) on (t_0, t_1) and t_1 is maximal, then either $t_1 = +\infty$ or there exists a sequence $t_n \to t_{1^-}$ as $n \to +\infty$ such that $(t_n, x(t_n)) \to \partial U$.*

Proof. See [8], Theorem 3.3.4. □

Theorem 1.27. *Suppose A and f as in Theorem 1.25 and also assume that A has compact resolvent and f takes all sets $\mathbb{R}^+ \times B \subset U \subset \mathbb{R} \times X^\alpha$ with B bounded and closed into bounded sets of X. If $x(t; t_0, x_0)$ is a solution of (2) in (t_0, ∞) with $|| x(t; t_0, x_0) ||_\alpha$ bounded as $t \to +\infty$, then $\{ x(t; t_0, x_0) \}_{t > t_0}$ is in a compact set of X^α.*

Proof. See [8], Theorem 3.3.6. □

1.4. **Global attractors and gradient systems.**

Definition 1.28. *A compact subset $\mathcal{A} \subset X$ which is invariant under the action of a C^r semigroup $\{T(t)\}_{t \ge 0}$ with $r \ge 0$ is called maximal if any compact invariant subset under $T(t)$ is contained in $\mathcal{A}$. A compact invariant set $\mathcal{A}$ is called a* global attractor *if $\mathcal{A}$ is invariant, maximal and attracts each bounded subset $B \subset X$.*

Definition 1.29. *A point $x \in X$ is called an* equilibrium point *of the C^r semigroup $\{T(t)\}_{t \ge 0}$ if $T(t)x = x$ for $t \ge 0$. An equilibrium point x is* hyperbolic *if $\sigma(DT(t)(x))$ does not intersect the unit circle with centered at the origin.*

Definition 1.30. *A semigroup $T(t) : X \to X, t \ge 0$ of class C^r, $r \ge 1$, is called a* gradient system *(or* gradient flow*) if*

(i) *Each bounded positive orbit is pre-compact.*

(ii) *There exists a Lyapunov functional for $T(t)$, that is, a continuous function $V : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with the following properties:*
(ii_1) *$V(x)$ is bounded below,*
(ii_2) *$V(x) \to \infty$ when $|\, x \,| \to \infty$,*
(ii_3) *$V(T(t)x)$ is decreasing in t for each $x \in X$,*
(ii_4) *$T(t)x$ is defined for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $V(T(t)x) = V(x)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then x is an equilibrium point.*

Theorem 1.31. *If $\{T(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ is a gradient system asymptotically smooth and the set E of equilibria is bounded, then there exists a global attractor $\mathcal{A}$ for $T(t)$ and $\mathcal{A} = W^u(E) = \{y \in X : T(-t)y$ is defined for $t \geq 0$ and $T(-t)y \to E$ when $t \to \infty\}$. If X is a Banach space, then $\mathcal{A}$ is connected. If, in addition each point in E is hyperbolic, then E is finite and*

$$\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{x \in E} W^u(x).$$

Proof. See [6], Theorem 3.8.5. □

Lemma 1.32. *Suppose Y is a metric space, Λ is an open set in Y, $\{-A_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is a family of operators in a Banach space X satisfying the conditions of Theorem 1.23 at $\lambda = \lambda_0$, U is an open set in $\mathbb{R}^+ \times X^\alpha$, $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ and $f : U \times \Lambda \to X$ is Hölder continuous in t. Suppose also that, for any bounded subset $D \subset U$, f is continuous in λ at λ_0 uniformly for (t, x) in D, and there is a constant $L = L(D)$, such that $\|f(t, x, \lambda) - f(t, y, \lambda)\| \leq L\|x - y\|_\alpha$ for (t, x), (t, y) in D and $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Suppose further that the solutions $x(t, x_0, \lambda)$ of the problem*

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = A_\lambda x + f(t, x, \lambda), \quad t > t_0$$
$$x(t_0) = x_0$$

exist and remain in a bounded subset of X^α when x_0 varies in a bounded subset of X^α, λ in a neighborhood of λ_0 and $t_0 \leq t \leq T$.

Then the function $\lambda \mapsto x(t, x_0, \lambda) \in X^\alpha$ is continuous at λ_0 uniformly for x_0 in bounded subsets of X^α and $t_0 \leq t \leq T$.

Proof. See [12], Lemma 3.7. □

We recall now that the family of subsets $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ of a metric space (X, d) is said to be *upper-semicontinuous* at $\lambda = \lambda_0$ if $\delta(\mathcal{A}_\lambda, \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0}) \to 0$ as $\lambda \to \lambda_0$, where $\delta(A, B) = \sup_{x\in A} d(x, B) = \sup_{x\in A} \inf_{y\in B} d(x, y)$ and *lower-semicontinuous* if $\delta(\mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0}, \mathcal{A}_\lambda) \to 0$ as $\lambda \to \lambda_0$.

Theorem 1.33. *Suppose Y is a metric space, Λ is an open set in Y, $\{-A_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is a family of operators in a Banach space X satisfying the conditions of Theorem 1.23 at $\lambda = \lambda_0$ with $b > 0$, U is an open set in X^α, $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ and $f : U \times \Lambda \to X$ satisfying the conditions of Lemma 1.32. Let $T(t, \lambda)(x_0)$ be the nonlinear semigroup in X^α given by the solutions of the*

problem

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx}{dt} &= A_\lambda x + f(x,\lambda), \quad t > t_0 \\ x(t_0) &= x_0. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Suppose also that, for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ there exists a global compact attractor $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ for $T(t,\lambda)(x)$, the union $\bigcup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \mathcal{A}_\lambda$ is a bounded set in X and f maps this union into a bounded set of X. Then the family $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ is upper semicontinuous at $\lambda = \lambda_0$.

Proof. See [12], Theorem 3.9. □

Lower semicontinuity can also be proved under some additional hypotheses.

Theorem 1.34. *Suppose, in addition to the hypotheses of Theorem 1.33, that the system generated by (3) is gradient for all λ, its equilibria are all hyperbolic and continuous in λ and the local invariant manifolds of the equilibria are continuous in λ. Then the family $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ is also lower semicontinuous at $\lambda = \lambda_0$.*

Proof. See [12], Theorem 4.10. □

2. Reduction to a fixed domain

Let Ω be the unit square in $\mathbb{R}^2$, and consider the family of maps $h_\epsilon : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^2$, defined by (1). For simplicity we will denote by Ω_ϵ the corresponding family of "perturbed domains" $\Omega_{h_\epsilon} = h_\epsilon(\Omega)$. We first establish some basic properties of these families.

Lemma 2.1. *If $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, the map h_ϵ defined by (1) belongs to $Diff^m(\Omega)$, for any $m \geq 1$ and $|| h_\epsilon - i_\Omega ||_{C^1(\Omega)} \to 0$, as $\epsilon \to 0$.*

Proof. It is clear that $h \in \mathcal{C}^m(\Omega)$ and is injective and $\dfrac{1}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(x)\,|} = \dfrac{1}{|\, 1 + \epsilon\, sen(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)\,|}$ is bounded in Ω if ϵ is sufficiently small, proving that $h_\epsilon \in Diff^m(\Omega)$. Now, a simple computation shows that

$$||h_\epsilon - i_\Omega||_{C^1(\Omega)} = \max\left\{ \sup_{(x_1,x_2)\,\in\,\Omega} \left|x_2 \epsilon sen(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)\right|, \sup_{(x_1,x_2)\in\Omega} \left(x_2^2 \epsilon^{2-2\alpha} cos^2(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha) + \epsilon^2 sen^2(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}.$$

Therefore, if $0 < \alpha < 1$, it follows that $|| h_\epsilon - i_\Omega ||_{C^1(\Omega)} \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. □

Remark 2.2. *The hypothesis $\alpha < 1$ is essential in the above proof, we do not have $\mathcal{C}^1$ convergence of h_ϵ if $\alpha \geq 1$. Also, convergence in the $\mathcal{C}^2$ norm only holds if $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$.*

Lemma 2.3. *If $s > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough, the map*

$$\begin{array}{rccc} h_\epsilon^* & : & H^s(\Omega_\epsilon) & \to & H^s(\Omega) \\ & & u & \longmapsto & u \circ h_\epsilon \end{array}$$

is an isomorphism, with inverse $h_\epsilon^{*-1} = (h_\epsilon^{-1})^*$.

Proof. We restrict ourselves to the case $0 \leq s < 1$, the proof for $s \geq 1$ is similar and is left to the reader. From Lemma 2.1 it is clear that h_ϵ^* is invertible with inverse $h_\epsilon^{*-1} = (h_\epsilon^{-1})^*$ if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. Now, since the derivatives of h_ϵ^{-1} are bounded below by a constant M, we have that $|h_\epsilon^{-1}(r) - h_\epsilon^{-1}(w)| \geq M|r-w|$, uniformly, for $(r,w) \in \Omega_\epsilon \times \Omega_\epsilon$. It follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
||\, h_\epsilon^* u \,||_{H^s(\Omega)} &:= \left\{ \int_\Omega |\,(u\circ h_\epsilon)(x)\,|^2 dx + \int_\Omega\int_\Omega \frac{\big|\,(u\circ h_\epsilon)(x) - (u\circ h_\epsilon)(y)\,\big|^2}{|\,x-y\,|^{2+2s}}\,dx\,dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \left\{ \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\,u(r)\,|^2 |\,Jh_\epsilon^{-1}(r)\,|\,dr \right. \\
&+ \left. \int_{\Omega_\epsilon}\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} \frac{\big|\,u(r)-u(w)\,\big|^2}{|\,h_\epsilon^{-1}(r) - h_\epsilon^{-1}(w)\,|^{2+2s}}\,|\,Jh_\epsilon^{-1}(r)\,|\,|\,Jh_\epsilon^{-1}(w)\,|\,dr\,dw \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \left\{ \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\,u(r)\,|^2 |\,Jh_\epsilon^{-1}(r)\,|\,dr \right. \\
&+ \left. \int_{\Omega_\epsilon}\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} \frac{\big|\,u(r)-u(w)\,\big|^2}{|\,r-w\,|^{2+2s}} \frac{|\,r-w\,|^{2+2s}}{|h_\epsilon^{-1}(r) - h_\epsilon^{-1}(w)|^{2+2s}} |Jh_\epsilon^{-1}(r)||Jh_\epsilon^{-1}(w)|drdw \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \left\{ \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\,u(r)\,|^2 |\,Jh_\epsilon^{-1}(r)\,|\,dr \right. \\
&+ \left. \int_{\Omega_\epsilon}\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} \frac{\big|\,u(r)-u(w)\,\big|^2}{|\,r-w\,|^{2+2s}} \frac{1}{M^{2+2s}} |Jh_\epsilon^{-1}(r)||Jh_\epsilon^{-1}(w)|drdw \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \left\{ K \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\,u(r)\,|^2\,dr + \frac{K^2}{(2M)^{2+2s}} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon}\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} \frac{\big|\,u(r)-u(w)\,\big|^2}{|\,r-w\,|^{2+2s}}\,drdw \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where K is a bound for $|\,Jh_\epsilon^{-1}(r)\,|$ in Ω_ϵ. A similar argument shows that $h_\epsilon^{*-1} = h_\epsilon^{*-1}$ is also bounded. □

Let Δ_{Ω_ϵ} be the Laplacian operator in the region $\Omega_\epsilon = h_\epsilon(\Omega)$. We want to find an expression for the differential operator $h_\epsilon^* \Delta_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^{*-1}$ in the fixed region Ω, in terms of h_ϵ. Writing $h_\epsilon(x) = h_\epsilon(x_1,x_2) = ((h_\epsilon)_1(x),(h_\epsilon)_2(x)) = (y_1,y_2) = y$, we obtain, for $i = 1,2$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(h_\epsilon^* \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} h_\epsilon^{*-1}(u) \right)(x) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}(u\circ h_\epsilon^{-1})(h_\epsilon(x)) \\
&= \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y)) \frac{\partial (h_\epsilon)_1^{-1}(y)}{\partial y_i}(y) + \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2}(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y)) \frac{\partial (h_\epsilon)_2^{-1}(y)}{\partial y_i}(y) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{2} \left[\left(\frac{\partial h_\epsilon}{\partial x_j} \right)^{-1} \right]_{j,i} (x) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j}(x) \qquad (4) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{2} b_{ij}(x) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j}(x)\,,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $b_{ij}(x)$ is the i,j-entry of the inverse transpose of the jacobian matrix of h_ϵ, given by

$$[h_\epsilon{}^{-1}]_x^T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \dfrac{-x_2\,\epsilon^{1-\alpha}cos(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)}{1+\epsilon\,sen(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)} \\ 0 & \dfrac{1}{1+\epsilon\,sen(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} h_\epsilon^*\Delta_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1}(u)(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^{2}\left(h_\epsilon^*\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i^2}h_\epsilon^{*-1}(u)\right)(x) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{2}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{2}b_{i\,k}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{2}b_{ij}\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j}\right)\right)(x) \\ &= div\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}+b_{12}\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2}\,,\,\left(b_{12}^2+b_{22}^2\right)\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2}+b_{12}\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}\right)(x) \\ &- \frac{\partial b_{12}}{\partial x_2}\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(x)-b_{12}\frac{\partial b_{12}}{\partial x_2}\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2}(x)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

We also need to compute the boundary condition $h_\epsilon^*\dfrac{\partial}{\partial N_{\Omega_\epsilon}}h_\epsilon^{*-1}u=0$ in the fixed region Ω in terms of h_ϵ. Let $N_{h_\epsilon(\Omega)}$ denote the outward unit normal to the boundary of $h_\epsilon(\Omega):=\Omega_\epsilon$. From (4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(h_\epsilon^*\frac{\partial}{\partial N_{\Omega_\epsilon}}h_\epsilon^{*-1}u\right)(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^{2}\left(h_\epsilon^*\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}h_\epsilon^{*-1}u\right)(x)\left(N_{\Omega_\epsilon}\right)_i(h_\epsilon(x)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{2}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}(u\circ h_\epsilon^{-1})(h_\epsilon(x))\left(N_{\Omega_\epsilon}\right)_i(h_\epsilon(x)) \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{2}b_{ij}(x)\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j}(x)\left(N_{\Omega_\epsilon}\right)_i(h_\epsilon(x)) \\ &= N_{\Omega_\epsilon}(h_\epsilon(x))\cdot\left(u_{x_1}(x)+b_{12}(x)u_{x_2}(x)\,,\,b_{22}(x)u_{x_2}(x)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Since

$$h_\epsilon^*N_{\Omega_\epsilon}(x)=N_{\Omega_\epsilon}(h_\epsilon(x))=\frac{[h_\epsilon^{-1}]_x^TN_\Omega(x)}{||\,[h_\epsilon^{-1}]_x^TN_\Omega(x)\,||}=\frac{\left((N_\Omega(x))_1+b_{12}(x)(N_\Omega(x))_2\,,\,b_{22}(x)(N_\Omega(x))_2\right)}{||\,[h_\epsilon^{-1}]_x^TN_\Omega(x)\,||}$$

(see [7]), we obtain from (6)

$$\left(h_\epsilon^*\frac{\partial}{\partial N_{\Omega_\epsilon}}h_\epsilon^{*-1}u\right)(x)=\frac{(N_\Omega(x))_1\left[u_{x_1}(x)+b_{12}(x)u_{x_2}(x)\right]+(N_\Omega(x))_2\left[b_{12}(x)u_{x_1}(x)+\left(b_{12}^2(x)+b_{22}^2(x)\right)u_{x_2}(x)\right.}{||\,[h_\epsilon^{-1}]_x^TN_\Omega(x)\,||}$$

Thus, the boundary condition $\left(h_\epsilon^*\dfrac{\partial}{\partial N_{\Omega_\epsilon}}h_\epsilon^{*-1}u\right)(x)=0$, becomes

$$(N_\Omega(x))_1\left[-u_{x_1}(x)\,-\,b_{12}(x)u_{x_2}(x)\right]+(N_\Omega(x))_2\left[-b_{12}(x)u_{x_1}(x)\,-\,\left(b_{12}^2(x)+b_{22}^2(x)\right)u_{x_2}(x)\right]=0\,,$$

which can be written as

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \left(N_\Omega(x)\right)_i \left(c_{ij} D_j u\right) = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\,,$$

where

$$c_{11} = -1\,,\ c_{12} = c_{21} = -b_{12}\,,\ c_{22} = -(\, b_{12}^2 + b_{22}^2\,)\,. \tag{7}$$

Now, observe that $v(.\,,t)$ is a solution (P_ϵ) in the perturbed region $\Omega_\epsilon = h_\epsilon(\Omega)$, if and only if $u(.\,,t) = h_\epsilon^* v(.,t)$ satisfies

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} u_t(x,t) &=& h_\epsilon^* \Delta_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^{*^{-1}} u(x,t) - a u(x,t) + f(u(x,t)),\ x \in \Omega \text{ and } t > 0, \\ h_\epsilon^* \dfrac{\partial}{\partial N_{\Omega_\epsilon}} h_\epsilon^{*^{-1}} u(x,t) &=& g(u(x,t)),\ x \in \partial\Omega \text{ and } t > 0\,, \end{array}\right. \tag{8}$$

in the *fixed* region Ω.

3. Sectoriality of the perturbed operators

In this section we show that the family of differential operators $-h_\epsilon^* \Delta_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^{*-1}$, appearing in (8), generate sectorial operators in various spaces.

3.1. **Sectoriality in L^2.** Consider the operator

$$A_\epsilon := \left(\, -h_\epsilon^* \Delta_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^{*-1} + aI \,\right) : L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega) \tag{9}$$

with domain

$$D\left(A_\epsilon\right) = \left\{ u \in H^2(\Omega) \,\middle|\, h_\epsilon^* \frac{\partial}{\partial N_{\Omega_\epsilon}} h_\epsilon^{*^{-1}} u = 0,\ \text{ on } \partial\Omega \right\}. \tag{10}$$

(We will denote simply by A the unperturbed operator $(\, -\Delta_\Omega + aI\,)$).

In the case of smooth domains, it is not difficult to prove that A_ϵ is sectorial, for ϵ sufficiently small, but for general Lipschitz domains, we need to address some delicate questions of regularity. Fortunately, in our case, Theorem 1.14 can be used, since we are dealing with a convex domain. However, this result is applicable only for operator in the divergence form. For this reason, using (5) we write our operator as sum

$$A_\epsilon = (\, C_\epsilon + aI + L_\epsilon\,) \tag{11}$$

where

$$C_\epsilon u = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} D_i \left(c_{ij} D_j u\right) \tag{12}$$

with the c_{ij} given in (7), and

$$L_\epsilon u := \frac{\partial b_{12}}{\partial x_2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1} + b_{12} \frac{\partial b_{12}}{\partial x_2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2}.$$

We now want to show that, if ϵ is small, the operator defined by (9) and (10) is sectorial. To this end, we need some auxiliary results for the first term in the decomposition (11).

Lemma 3.1. *If $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, the differential operator C_ϵ given by (12) is strongly elliptic.*

Proof. If $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, we have $c_{11} = -1$, $-\frac{1}{4} < c_{12} = c_{21} = -b_{12} < \frac{1}{4}$ and $c_{22} = -(\, b_{12}^2 + b_{22}^2\,) < -\frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, if $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} c_{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \leq & -\frac{1}{2}\xi_1^{\,2} + \frac{1}{2}|\,\xi_1\,|\,|\,\xi_2\,| - \frac{1}{2}\xi_2^{\,2} \\ &= -\frac{1}{4}(\,\xi_1^{\,2} + \xi_2^{\,2}\,) - \left(\frac{1}{4}\xi_1^{\,2} - \frac{1}{2}|\,\xi_1\,|\,|\,\xi_2\,| + \frac{1}{4}\xi_2^{\,2}\right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{4}(\,\xi_1^{\,2} + \xi_2^{\,2}\,) - \left(\frac{1}{2}|\,\xi_1\,| - \frac{1}{2}|\,\xi_2\,|\right)^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{4}(\,\xi_1^{\,2} + \xi_2^{\,2}\,)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

□

Lemma 3.2. *If $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough, the operator C_ϵ in $L^2(\Omega)$ defined by* (12)*, with domain*

$$D(C_\epsilon) = \left\{ u \in H^2(\Omega) \;\middle|\; \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \left(N_\Omega(x)\right)_i \left(c_{ij} D_j u\right) = 0\,,\; x \in \partial\Omega \right\}, \tag{14}$$

is symmetric and bounded below.

Proof. Using integration by parts, we have, for any $u, v \in D(C_\epsilon)$

$$\begin{aligned}\langle C_\epsilon u\,,\, v\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} &= \int_{\partial\Omega} v \left[\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \left(N_\Omega(x)\right)_i \left(c_{ij} D_j u\right)\right] d\sigma(x) - \int_\Omega \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} (c_{ij} D_j u D_i v)\, dx \\ &= -\int_\Omega \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} (c_{ji} D_i v D_j u)\, dx \\ &= \langle u\,,\, C_\epsilon v\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}\,,\end{aligned}$$

proving that the operator C_ϵ is symmetric. Now, from (13), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle C_\epsilon u\,,\, u\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} &= \int_\Omega \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} D_i \left(c_{ij} D_j u\right) \cdot u\, dx \\ &= -\int_\Omega \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} (c_{ij} D_j u D_i u)\, dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4}\int_\Omega |\,\nabla u\,|^2\, dx\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

so C_ϵ is bounded below. □

Remark 3.3. *If u and v are complex valued with real and imaginary parts in $D(C_\epsilon)$, we still have (see remark 1.13),*

$$\begin{aligned}\langle C_\epsilon u\,,\, u\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} &= \int_\Omega \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} D_i\left(c_{ij}D_j u\right)\cdot \overline{u}\,dx\\ &= -\int_\Omega \sum_{i,j=1}^{2}(c_{ij}D_j u\overline{D_i u})\,dx\\ &\geq \frac{1}{4}\int_\Omega |\,\nabla u\,|^2\,dx. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Lemma 3.4. *If $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small and $a > 0$, then the problem*

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} C_\epsilon u + au &=& f,\quad x\in\Omega\\ \displaystyle\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\left(N_\Omega(x)\right)_i\left(c_{ij}D_j u\right) &=& 0,\ x\in\partial\Omega \end{array}\right. \tag{17}$$

has a unique solution $u\in H^2(\Omega)$, for any $f\in L^2(\Omega)$.

Proof. Since Ω is a bounded and convex domain, we have by Theorem 1.14 that, for any $f\in L^2(\Omega)$ and $a>0$, there exist a unique solution $u\in H^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$-\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\int_\Omega c_{ij}D_j u D_i v\,dx \,+\, a\int_\Omega uv\,dx \,=\, \int_\Omega fv\,dx\,,$$

for any $v\in H^1(\Omega)$. Integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} D_i\left(c_{ij}D_j u\right)v\,dx - \int_{\partial\Omega}\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\left(N_\Omega(x)\right)_i\left(c_{ij}D_j u\right)v\,d\sigma(x) \,+\, a\int_\Omega uv\,dx \,=\, \int_\Omega fv\,dx\,.$$

Therefore, for any $v\in H_0^1(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} D_i\left(c_{ij}D_j u\right)v\,dx \,+\, a\int_\Omega uv\,dx \,=\, \int_\Omega fv\,dx\,,$$

from which the first equation in (17) follows immediately.

Thus, for any $v\in H^1(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$\int_{\partial\Omega}\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\left(N_\Omega(x)\right)_i\left(c_{ij}D_j u\right)v\,d\sigma(x) \,=\, \int_\Omega \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} D_i\left(c_{ij}D_j u\right)v\,dx\; a\int_\Omega uv\,dx \,-\, \int_\Omega fv\,dx \,=0,$$

and the boundary condition in (17) also follows. □

Theorem 3.5. *If ϵ is small enough, the operator C_ϵ in $L^2(\Omega)$ defined by (12) , with domain given by (14) is self-adjoint.*

Proof. It is clear that C_ϵ is densely defined. It is also symmetric and lower bounded by Lemma 3.2. From Lemma 3.4 it follows that $C_\epsilon + aId$ is surjective for any $a > 0$ and therefore, an isomorphism from $D(C_\epsilon)$ to $L^2(\Omega)$. Thus $(C_\epsilon + aId)^{-1}$ is continuous as an operator in $L^2(\Omega)$ so it has a closed graph, from which it follows that C_ϵ is closed. From well-known results (see, for instance [14] Prop. 3.11)) it follows that C_ϵ is self-adjoint. □

From Theorem 3.5 it already follows that C_ϵ is a sectorial operator, but we give a direct proof to display the value of the constants appearing in Definition 1.15.

Theorem 3.6. *If ϵ is small enough, the operator C_ϵ in $L^2(\Omega)$ defined by (12), with domain given by (14) is sectorial and the sector in Definition 1.15 can be chosen with vertex at any $b < 0$ and opening angle $0 < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$, and constant $M = cosec(\theta)$.*

Proof. We first observe that, as needed when treating spectral theory, we work in the complexification of the relevant spaces. For simplicity however, we will not change notation, writing for instance, $D(C_\epsilon)$ for the complexification of the domain of the operator C_ϵ. Let $b < 0$, $0 < \phi < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\lambda = \alpha + i\beta$ a complex number in the sector $S_{b,\theta} = \left\{ \lambda \,\middle|\, \theta \leq |\, arg(\lambda - b)\,| \leq \pi,\, \lambda \neq b \right\}$. If u is in (the complexification of) $D(C_\epsilon)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\,(C_\epsilon - \lambda)\,u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\,\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\geq \|\,\langle (C_\epsilon - \lambda)\,u\,,\,u\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}\,\| \\ &= \|\,\langle (C_\epsilon - \alpha)\,u - i\beta u\,,\,u\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}\,\| \\ &= \left[\langle (C_\epsilon - \alpha)\,u\,,\,u\rangle^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \beta^2\,\langle u\,,\,u\rangle^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

If $\alpha \leq b$, it follows from (18) and (16) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\,(C_\epsilon - \lambda)\,u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\,\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\geq \left[\langle (C_\epsilon - b)\,u\,,\,u\rangle^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \langle (b-\alpha)\,u\,,\,u\rangle^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \beta^2\,\langle u\,,\,u\rangle^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\geq \left[\,(b-\alpha)^2 + \beta^2\,\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\langle u\,,\,u\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\|\,(C_\epsilon - \lambda)\,u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq |\lambda - b|\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, for any $u \in D(C_\epsilon)$ and thus

$$||\,(C_\epsilon - \lambda)^{-1}\,u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{|\lambda - b|}\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \tag{19}$$

and the resolvent inequality in Definition 1.15 holds with $M = 1$.

If $\alpha \geq b$, then $\beta \geq \tan(\theta)$, and it follows from (18) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\,(C_\epsilon - \lambda)\,u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\,\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\geq \left[\beta^2\,\langle u\,,\,u\rangle^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\geq |\beta|\,\langle u\,,\,u\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\|\,(C_\epsilon - \lambda)\,u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq |\lambda - b|\frac{|\beta|}{|\lambda - b|}\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq |\lambda - b|\sin\theta\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, for any $u \in D(C_\epsilon)$ and thus

$$||\,(C_\epsilon - \lambda)^{-1}\,u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{cosec(\theta)}{|\lambda - b|}\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \tag{20}$$

and the resolvent inequality in Definition 1.15 holds with $M = cosec(\theta)$.

From (19) and (20), we conclude that C_ϵ is sectorial, and the sector in Definition 1.15 can be any sector with vertex in $b < 0$ and opening angle $0 < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$, with constant $M = cosec(\theta)$. □

Theorem 3.7. *If $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small and $h_\epsilon \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(\Omega)$, then the operator $A_\epsilon = (\, -h_\epsilon^* \Delta_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^{*-1} + aI\,)$ defined by (9) and (10) is sectorial.*

Proof. We write the operator as in (11) $A_\epsilon = -h_\epsilon^* \Delta_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^{*-1} + aI = C_\epsilon + aI + L_\epsilon$, and observe that, if ϵ is small enough, by Theorem 3.6 the operator $C_\epsilon + aI$ is sectorial with vertex in the origin and opening angle $0 < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$, with constant $M = cosec(\theta)$. For definiteness, we may take $\theta = \dfrac{\pi}{6}$, $M = 2$.

Furthermore, by (15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\,(C_\epsilon + a)\,u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\geq \langle (C_\epsilon + a)\,u\,,\, u\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4}\int_\Omega |\,\nabla u\,|^2\,dx + a\int_\Omega |\,u\,|^2\,dx \\ &\geq K||u||^2_{H^1(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $K = \min\left\{\dfrac{1}{4}, a\right\}$ is a positive constant. Thus $\|\,(C_\epsilon + a)\,u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq K||u||_{H^1(\Omega)}$.

Now, $D(C_\epsilon + aI + L_\epsilon) = D(C_\epsilon + aI)$ and for any $u \in D(C_\epsilon + aI)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\big|\big|\ (C_\epsilon u + au + L_\epsilon u) - (C_\epsilon u + au)\ \big|\big|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \big|\big|\, L_\epsilon u\,\big|\big|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \left|\left|\frac{\partial b_{12}}{\partial x_2}\right|\right|_\infty \left|\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}\right|\right|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \left|\left| b_{12}\frac{\partial b_{12}}{\partial x_2}\right|\right|_\infty \left|\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2}\right|\right|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq k_1\left(\left|\left|\frac{\partial b_{12}}{\partial x_2}\right|\right|_\infty + \left|\left| b_{12}\frac{\partial b_{12}}{\partial x_2}\right|\right|_\infty\right) ||\,u\,||_{H^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq k_2\left(\left|\left|\frac{\partial b_{12}}{\partial x_2}\right|\right|_\infty + \left|\left| b_{12}\frac{\partial b_{12}}{\partial x_2}\right|\right|_\infty\right) ||\,(C_\epsilon + aI)u\,||_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \eta(\epsilon)\,||\,(C_\epsilon + aI)u\,||_{L^2(\Omega)}\,, \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta(\epsilon) \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. From Lemma 1.22, we conclude that the operator

$$A_\epsilon := C_\epsilon + aI + L_\epsilon$$

is sectorial with the sector in Definition 1.15 given by

$$S_{0,\frac{\pi}{6}} = \left\{\, \lambda \,\middle|\, \frac{\pi}{6} \leq |\,arg(\lambda)\,| \leq \pi,\ \lambda \neq 0 \,\right\} \tag{21}$$

and

$$||\,(\,\lambda - A_\epsilon\,)^{-1}|| \leq \frac{4\sqrt{5}}{|\,\lambda\,|}\,, \quad \text{for all} \quad \lambda \in S_{0,\frac{\pi}{6}}. \tag{22}$$

□

Remark 3.8. *From the proof above, we can see that the sector and constant M in the resolvent inequality can be chosen independently of ϵ, for instance, as given in (21) and (22).*

3.2. **Sectoriality in H^{-1}.** We now want to extend the operator $A_\epsilon = (-h_\epsilon^* \Delta_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^{*-1} + aI)$ to an operator $\widetilde{A}_\epsilon$ in $H^{-1}(\Omega)$ with $D(\widetilde{A}_\epsilon) = H^1(\Omega)$ and show that this extension is also sectorial for ϵ small enough.

If $u \in D(A_\epsilon) = \left\{ u \in H^2(\Omega) \;\middle|\; h_\epsilon^* \dfrac{\partial}{\partial N_{\Omega_\epsilon}} h_\epsilon^{*-1} u = 0 \right\}$, $\psi \in H^1(\Omega)$, and $v = u \circ h_\epsilon^{-1}$, we obtain, integrating by parts

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle A_\epsilon u\,,\, \psi\rangle_{-1,1} &= -\int_\Omega (h_\epsilon^* \Delta_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^{*-1} u)(x)\, \psi(x)\, dx + a\int_\Omega u(x)\psi(x)\, dx \\
&= -\int_\Omega \Delta_{\Omega_\epsilon}(u\circ h_\epsilon^{-1})(h_\epsilon(x))\, \psi(x)\, dx + a\int_\Omega u(x)\psi(x)\, dx \\
&= -\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} \Delta_{\Omega_\epsilon} v(y)\psi(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y)) \frac{1}{|Jh_\epsilon(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y))|} dy + a\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} u(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y))\psi(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y)) \frac{1}{|Jh_\epsilon(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y))|} dy \\
&= -\int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} \frac{\partial v}{\partial N_{\Omega_\epsilon}}(y)\, \psi(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y)) \frac{1}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y))\,|}\, d\sigma(y) \\
&+ \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} \nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon} v(y)\cdot \nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}\psi(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y)) \frac{1}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y))\,|}\, dy \\
&+ a\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} u(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y))\psi(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y))\, \frac{1}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y))\,|}\, dy \\
&= \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} \nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon} v(y)\cdot \nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}\psi(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y)) \frac{1}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y))\,|}\, dy \\
&+ a\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} u(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y))\psi(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y))\, \frac{1}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(h_\epsilon^{-1}(y))\,|}\, dy \\
&= \int_\Omega \nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon} v(h_\epsilon(x))\cdot \nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}\psi\circ h_\epsilon^{-1} \frac{1}{|Jh_\epsilon\circ h_\epsilon^{-1}|}(h_\epsilon(x))|Jh_\epsilon(x)|dx + a\int_\Omega u(x)\psi(x)dx \\
&= \int_\Omega (h_\epsilon^* \nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^{*-1} u)(x)\cdot \left(h_\epsilon^* \nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^{*-1} \frac{\psi}{|\, Jh_\epsilon\,|}\right)(x)\,|\, Jh_\epsilon(x)\,|\, dx \; + a\int_\Omega u(x)\psi(x)\, dx.
\end{aligned}
\tag{23}
$$

Since (23) is well defined for $u \in H^1(\Omega)$, we may define an extension $\widetilde{A}_\epsilon$ of A_ϵ, with values in $H^{-1}(\Omega)$ by this expression. For simplicity, we still denote this extension by A_ϵ, whenever there is no danger of confusion. We now show that this extension is a sectorial operator.

Theorem 3.9. *If $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, the operator A_ϵ defined by (23), with domain $H^1(\Omega)$ is sectorial.*

Proof. We will apply Lemma 1.22 again. If $\epsilon = 0$ we obtain, from (23)

$$\langle A_\epsilon u\,,\,u\rangle_{-1,1} = \langle Au\,,\,u\rangle_{-1,1} \geq \int_\Omega |\nabla_\Omega|^2(x)\,dx + a\int_\Omega u^2(x)\,dx.$$

From the Lax-Milgram Theorem, it follows that, for any $\psi \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$, there exists $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ with $Au = \psi$, so Au is well defined as an operator in $H^{-1}(\Omega)$, with $D(A) = H^1(\Omega)$. Using the same arguments of Theorems 3.5 and 3.6, we prove that A is self-adjoint and sectorial with

$$\|\,(A-\lambda)^{-1}\,\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{cosec(\theta)}{|\lambda - b|},\ \text{for}\ \lambda \in S_{b\,,\theta} = \big\{\lambda\,\big|\,\theta \leq |arg(\lambda - b)| \leq \pi,\ \lambda \neq b\big\}\ and\, \theta \in \Big(0, \frac{\pi}{2}\Big).$$

We now want to show that the family of operators $\big\{A_\epsilon\big\}$ satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 1.22 for ϵ small. Clearly $D\big(A_\epsilon\big) \supset D\big(A\big)$ for any $\epsilon \geq 0$. We now prove that there exists a positive function $\tau(\epsilon)$ such that

$$\big|\big|\,\big(A_\epsilon - A\big)u\,\big|\big|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \leq \tau(\epsilon)\big|\big|\,A\,u\,\big|\big|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}\,,$$

for all $u \in D\big(A\big)$, with $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\tau(\epsilon) = 0$, which is equivalent to

$$\big|\,\big\langle\,\big(A_\epsilon - A\big)u\,,\,\psi\,\big\rangle_{-1,1}\big| \leq \tau(\epsilon)||\,u\,||_{H^1(\Omega)}||\,\psi\,||_{H^1(\Omega)}\,,$$

for all $u, \psi \in H^1(\Omega)$, with $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\tau(\epsilon) = 0$. In fact, we have, for $\epsilon > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big|\big\langle\,\big(A_\epsilon - A\,\big)u\,,\,\psi\,\big\rangle_{-1,1}\Big| &= \Big|\int_\Omega \big(\,h_\epsilon^*\nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1}u\,\big)(x)\cdot\left(\,h_\epsilon^*\nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1}\frac{\psi}{|\,Jh_\epsilon\,|}\right)(x)\,|\,Jh_\epsilon(x)\,|\,dx \\
&\quad - \int_\Omega \nabla_\Omega u(x)\cdot\nabla_\Omega\psi(x)\,dx\Big| \\
&= \Big|\int_\Omega \big(h_\epsilon^*\nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1}u - \nabla_\Omega u\big)(x)\cdot\left(h_\epsilon^*\nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1}\frac{\psi}{|Jh_\epsilon|}\right)(x)\,|\,Jh_\epsilon(x)\,| \\
&\quad + \nabla_\Omega u(x)\cdot\left(h_\epsilon^*\nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1}\frac{\psi}{|Jh_\epsilon|}\right)(x)\,|Jh_\epsilon(x)| - \nabla_\Omega u(x)\cdot\nabla_\Omega\psi(x)\,dx\Big| \\
&= \Big|\int_\Omega \big(h_\epsilon^*\nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1}u - \nabla_\Omega u\big)(x)\cdot\left(h_\epsilon^*\nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1}\frac{\psi}{|\,Jh_\epsilon\,|}\right)(x)\,|\,Jh_\epsilon(x)\,| \\
&\quad + \nabla_\Omega u(x)\cdot\left[h_\epsilon^*\nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1}\frac{\psi}{|\,Jh_\epsilon\,|}(x) - \nabla_\Omega\left(\frac{\psi}{|\,Jh_\epsilon\,|}\right)(x)\right]\,|\,Jh_\epsilon(x)\,| \\
&\quad + \nabla_\Omega u(x)\cdot\nabla_\Omega\left(\frac{\psi}{|\,Jh_\epsilon\,|}\right)(x)|\,Jh_\epsilon(x)\,| - \nabla_\Omega u(x)\cdot\nabla_\Omega\psi(x)\,dx\Big| \\
&\leq \int_\Omega\left|(h_\epsilon^*\nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1}u - \nabla_\Omega u)(x)\cdot\left(h_\epsilon^*\nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1}\frac{\psi}{|Jh_\epsilon|}\right)(x)\right||Jh_\epsilon(x)|dx \quad (24) \\
&\quad + \int_\Omega\left|\,\nabla_\Omega u(x)\cdot\big(h_\epsilon^*\nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1} - \nabla_\Omega\big)\left(\frac{\psi}{|\,Jh_\epsilon\,|}\right)(x)\,\right|\,|Jh_\epsilon(x)|\,dx \quad (25)
\end{aligned}$$

$$+\int_\Omega \psi(x)\nabla_\Omega u(x)\cdot\nabla_\Omega\left(\frac{1}{|\,Jh_\epsilon\,|}\right)(x)\,|\,Jh_\epsilon(x)\,|\,dx\,. \tag{26}$$

To estimate (24), (25) and (26), we use the expression for $h_\epsilon^*\nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1}$ in terms of the coefficients of $[h_\epsilon{}^{-1}]_x^T$ given by (4). For (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega\left|\left(h_\epsilon^*\nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1}u-\nabla_\Omega u\right)(x)\cdot\left(h_\epsilon^*\nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon}h_\epsilon^{*-1}\frac{\psi}{|\,Jh_\epsilon\,|}\right)(x)\right||\,Jh_\epsilon(x)\,|\,dx\\
\leq&\int_\Omega\left|\begin{pmatrix}\sum_{j=1}^2(b_{1j}(x)-\delta_{1j})\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j}(x)\\ \sum_{j=1}^2(b_{2j}(x)-\delta_{2j})\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j}(x)\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\sum_{j=1}^2 b_{1j}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\left(\frac{\psi}{|Jh_\epsilon|}\right)(x)\\ \sum_{j=1}^2 b_{2j}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\left(\frac{\psi}{|Jh_\epsilon|}\right)(x)\end{pmatrix}\right|\big|1+\epsilon sen(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)\big|dx\\
\leq&\max_{(x_1,x_2)\,\in\,]0,1[\times]0,1[}\left\{\,|\,Jh_\epsilon(x)\,|\,\right\}\int_\Omega\left[b_{12}^2(x)\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2}\right)^2+\big(\,b_{22}(x)-1\,\big)^2\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2}\right)^2\right]^{\frac12}\\
&\cdot\left\{\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\left(\frac{\psi}{|Jh_\epsilon|}\right)(x)+b_{12}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\left(\frac{\psi}{|Jh_\epsilon|}\right)(x)\right]^2+b_{22}^2(x)\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\left(\frac{\psi}{|Jh_\epsilon|}\right)(x)\right]^2\right\}^{\frac12}dx\\
\leq&\max_{(x_1,x_2)\,\in\,]0,1[\times]0,1[}\left\{\,|\,Jh_\epsilon(x)\,|\,\right\}\underbrace{\left\{\int_\Omega\left[\,b_{12}^2(x)+(b_{22}(x)-1)^2\,\right]\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2}\right)^2dx\right\}^{\frac12}}_{(I)}\\
&\cdot\underbrace{\left\{\int_\Omega\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\left(\frac{\psi}{|Jh_\epsilon|}\right)(x)+b_{12}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\left(\frac{\psi}{|Jh_\epsilon|}\right)(x)\right]^2+b_{22}^2(x)\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\left(\frac{\psi}{|Jh_\epsilon|}\right)(x)\right]^2dx\right\}^{\frac12}}_{(II)}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the integral (I), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\{\int_\Omega\left[b_{12}^2(x)+\big(b_{22}(x)-1\big)^2\right]\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2}\right)^2dx\right\}^{\frac12}&=\left\{\int_\Omega\frac{x_2^2\epsilon^{2-2\alpha}cos^2(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)+\epsilon^2sen^2(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)}{[1+\epsilon sen(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)]^2}\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2}\right)^2dx\right\}^{\frac12}\\
&\leq\left\{\int_\Omega\frac{x_2^2\epsilon^{\,2-2\alpha}+\epsilon^{\,2}}{[\,1+\epsilon\,sen(x_1/\epsilon^{\,\alpha})\,]^{\,2}}\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_2}\right)^2dx\right\}^{\frac12}\\
&\leq\big(\,K_1(\epsilon)\,\big)^{\frac12}\left\{\int_\Omega\nabla_\Omega u(x)\cdot\nabla_\Omega u(x)\,dx\right\}^{\frac12},
\end{aligned}$$

where $K_1(\epsilon):=\dfrac{x_2^2\epsilon^{\,2-2\alpha}+\epsilon^{\,2}}{[\,1+\epsilon\,sen(x_1/\epsilon^{\,\alpha})\,]^{\,2}}\to 0$ as $h_\epsilon\to i_\Omega$ in $C^1(\Omega)$.

To estimate the integral (II), we first observe that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\left(\frac{1}{|\,Jh_\epsilon(x)\,|}\right)=-\frac{\epsilon^{\,1-\alpha}\,cos(x_1/\epsilon^{\,\alpha})}{[\,1+\epsilon\,sen(x_1/\epsilon^{\,\alpha})\,]^{\,2}}\quad\text{and}\quad\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\left(\frac{1}{|\,Jh_\epsilon(x)\,|}\right)=0\,.$$

Therefore, we have the following estimate for (II) :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ \int_\Omega \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left(\frac{\psi}{|\, Jh_\epsilon \,|} \right)(x) + b_{12}(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \left(\frac{\psi}{|\, Jh_\epsilon \,|} \right)(x) \right]^2 + b_{22}^2(x) \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \left(\frac{\psi}{|\, Jh_\epsilon \,|} \right)(x) \right]^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\leq & \left\{ \int_\Omega 2 \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left(\frac{\psi}{|\, Jh_\epsilon \,|} \right)(x) \right]^2 + \left(2b_{12}^2(x) + b_{22}^2(x) \right) \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \left(\frac{\psi}{|\, Jh_\epsilon \,|} \right)(x) \right]^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
= & \left\{ \int_\Omega 2 \left[\psi(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left(\frac{1}{|Jh_\epsilon(x)|} \right) + \frac{1}{|Jh_\epsilon(x)|} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_1}(x) \right]^2 + \left(2b_{12}^2(x) + b_{22}^2(x) \right) \left[\frac{1}{|Jh_\epsilon(x)|} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_2}(x) \right]^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\leq & \left\{ \int_\Omega 4\psi^2 \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left(\frac{1}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|} \right) \right]^2 + \frac{4}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|^2} \left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_1}(x) \right)^2 \right. \\
+ & \left. \left(2b_{12}^2(x) + b_{22}^2(x) \right) \frac{1}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|^2} \left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_2}(x) \right)^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\leq & \underbrace{\left\{ \int_\Omega \left[4 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left(\frac{1}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|} \right) \right)^2 \right] \psi^2(x) dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}}_{(III)} \\
+ & \underbrace{\left\{ \int_\Omega \frac{4}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|^2} \left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_1}(x) \right)^2 + \frac{2b_{12}^2(x) + b_{22}^2(x)}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|^2} \left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_2}(x) \right)^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}}_{(IV)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

To estimate (III), we first observe that

$$
K_2(\epsilon) := 4 \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left(\frac{1}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|} \right) \right]^2 = \frac{4\epsilon^{2-2\alpha} \cos^2(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)}{[\, 1 + \epsilon\, sen(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha) \,]^4} \to 0
$$

as $h_\epsilon \to i_\Omega$ in $C^1(\Omega)$. Therefore

$$
\left\{ \int_\Omega \left[4 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left(\frac{1}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|} \right) \right)^2 \right] \psi^2(x) dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left(K_2(\epsilon) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\int_\Omega \psi^2 dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}},
$$

with $\left(K_2(\epsilon) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \to 0$.

To estimate (IV), observe that

$$
\frac{4}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|^2} = \frac{4}{[\, 1 + \epsilon\, sen(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha) \,]^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{2b_{12}^2(x) + b_{22}^2(x)}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|^2} = \frac{2x_2^2 \epsilon^{2-2\alpha} \cos^2(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha) + 1}{[\, 1 + \epsilon\, sen(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha) \,]^4}
$$

are bounded for $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Thus

$$
\left\{ \int_\Omega \frac{4}{|Jh_\epsilon(x)|^2} \left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_1}(x) \right)^2 + \frac{2b_{12}^2(x) + b_{22}^2(x)}{|Jh_\epsilon(x)|^2} \left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_2}(x) \right)^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq K_3 \left\{ \int_\Omega \nabla_\Omega \psi(x) \cdot \nabla_\Omega \psi(x)\, dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}},
$$

where K_3 is a positive constant. We then have the following estimate for (24):

$$\int_\Omega \left| \big(h_\epsilon^* \nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^{*-1} u - \nabla_\Omega u\big)(x) \cdot \left(h_\epsilon^* \nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^{*-1} \frac{\psi}{|\, Jh_\epsilon \,|} \right)(x) \right| \, |\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|\, dx$$

$$\leq \max_{(x_1,x_2)\,\in\,]0,1[\times]0,1[} \big\{\, |\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|\, \big\}\, [\, K_1(\epsilon) K_2(\epsilon)\,]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \int_\Omega \psi^{\,2}\, dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \int_\Omega \nabla_\Omega u \cdot \nabla_\Omega u \, dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$+ \max_{(x_1,x_2)\,\in\,]0,1[\times]0,1[} \big\{\, |\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|\, \big\} [\, K_1(\epsilon)\,]^{\frac{1}{2}} K_3 \left\{ \int_\Omega \nabla_\Omega \psi \cdot \nabla_\Omega \psi \, dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \int_\Omega \nabla_\Omega u \cdot \nabla_\Omega u \, dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Taking

$$C_0(\epsilon) := \max_{(x_1,x_2)\,\in\,]0,1[\times]0,1[} \big\{ \big| Jh_\epsilon(x) \big| \big\} [K_1(\epsilon) K_2(\epsilon)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad C_0'(\epsilon) := \max_{(x_1,x_2)\,\in\,]0,1[\times]0,1[} \big\{ \big| Jh_\epsilon(x) \big| \big\} [K_1(\epsilon)]^{\frac{1}{2}} K_3\,,$$

we have that $C_0(\epsilon)$ and $C_0'(\epsilon) \to 0$ when $h_\epsilon \to i_\Omega$ in $C^1(\Omega)$.

We estimate (25) in a similar way:

$$\int_\Omega \left| \nabla_\Omega u(x) \cdot \big(h_\epsilon^* \nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^{*-1} - \nabla_\Omega \big) \left(\frac{\psi}{|\, Jh_\epsilon \,|}(x) \right) \right| \, |\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|\, dx$$

$$\leq \max_{(x_1,x_2)\,\in\,]0,1[\times]0,1[} \big\{ \big| Jh_\epsilon(x) \big| \big\} \left\{ \int_\Omega \big| \nabla_\Omega u(x) \big|^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \underbrace{\left\{ \int_\Omega \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[\sum_{j=1}^2 \big(b_{ij}(x) - \delta_{ij} \big) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left(\frac{\psi}{|Jh_\epsilon|}(x) \right) \right]^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}}_{(V)}.$$

For the integrand in (V), we have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \left[\sum_{j=1}^2 \big(b_{ij}(x) - \delta_{ij} \big) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left(\frac{\psi}{|\, Jh_\epsilon \,|}(x) \right) \right]^2$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[\big(b_{i1}(x) - \delta_{i1} \big) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left(\frac{\psi}{|\, Jh_\epsilon \,|}(x) \right) + \big(b_{i2}(x) - \delta_{i2} \big) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \left(\frac{\psi}{|\, Jh_\epsilon \,|}(x) \right) \right]^2$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^2 \left\{ 2 \big(b_{i1}(x) - \delta_{i1} \big)^2 \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left(\frac{\psi}{|\, Jh_\epsilon \,|} \right)(x) \right]^2 + 2 \big(b_{i2}(x) - \delta_{i2} \big)^2 \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \left(\frac{\psi}{|\, Jh_\epsilon \,|} \right)(x) \right]^2 \right\}$$

$$= \big[\, 2 b_{12}^2(x) + 2 \big(b_{22}(x) - 1 \big)^2 \big] \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \left(\frac{\psi}{|\, Jh_\epsilon \,|} \right)(x) \right]^2$$

$$= \big[\, 2 b_{12}^2(x) + 2 \big(b_{22}(x) - 1 \big)^2 \big] \frac{1}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|^2} \left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_2}(x) \right)^2.$$

We then have, for the integral (V)

$$\left\{ \int_\Omega \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[\sum_{j=1}^2 \big(b_{ij}(x) - \delta_{ij} \big) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left(\frac{\psi}{|Jh_\epsilon|}(x) \right) \right]^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left\{ \int_\Omega \frac{2 b_{12}^2(x) + 2 \big(b_{22}(x) - 1 \big)^2}{|Jh_\epsilon(x)|^2} \left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_2}(x) \right)^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

and

$$K_4(\epsilon) := \frac{2 b_{12}^2(x) + 2 \big(b_{22}(x) - 1 \big)^2}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|^2} = \frac{2 x_2^2\, \epsilon^{\,2-2\alpha} cos^{\,2}(x_1/\epsilon^{\,\alpha}) + 2 \epsilon^{\,2} sen^{\,2}(x_1/\epsilon^{\,\alpha})}{|\, Jh_\epsilon(x) \,|^2} \to 0$$

when $h_\epsilon \to i_\Omega$ in $C^1(\Omega)$. Thus, taking $C_1(\epsilon) := \max_{(x_1,x_2)\in\,]0,1[\times]0,1[} \left\{ \mid Jh_\epsilon(x) \mid \right\} [K_4(\epsilon)]^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we have the following estimate for (25):

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_\Omega \left| \nabla_\Omega u(x) \cdot \left(h_\epsilon^* \nabla_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^{*-1} - \nabla_\Omega \right) \left(\frac{\psi}{\mid Jh_\epsilon \mid}(x) \right) \right| \mid Jh_\epsilon(x) \mid dx \\ \leq \;& C_1(\epsilon) \left\{ \int_\Omega \nabla_\Omega \psi \cdot \nabla_\Omega \psi \, dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \int_\Omega \nabla_\Omega u \cdot \nabla_\Omega u \, dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

with $C_1(\epsilon) \to 0$ as $h_\epsilon \to i_\Omega$ in $C^1(\Omega)$.

Finally we have for the integral (26):

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_\Omega \left| \psi(x) \nabla_\Omega u(x) \cdot \nabla_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{\mid Jh_\epsilon(x) \mid} \right) \right| \mid Jh_\epsilon(x) \mid dx \\ \leq \;& \max_{(x_1,x_2)\in\,]0,1[\times]0,1[} \left\{ \mid Jh_\epsilon(x) \mid \right\} \int_\Omega \psi(x) \left[\sum_{j=1}^2 \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\sum_{j=1}^2 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left(\frac{1}{\mid Jh_\epsilon(x) \mid} \right) \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} dx \\ \leq \;& \max_{(x_1,x_2)\in\,]0,1[\times]0,1[} \left\{ \mid Jh_\epsilon(x) \mid \right\} \left\{ \int_\Omega \psi^2(x) dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \int_\Omega \sum_{j=1}^2 \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j} \right)^2 \left[\sum_{j=1}^2 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left(\frac{1}{|Jh_\epsilon(x)|} \right) \right)^2 \right] dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ = \;& \max_{(x_1,x_2)\in\,]0,1[\times]0,1[} \left\{ \mid Jh_\epsilon(x) \mid \right\} \left\{ \int_\Omega \psi^2(x) dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \int_\Omega \sum_{j=1}^2 \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j} \right)^2 \left[\frac{\epsilon^{2-2\alpha} cos^2(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)}{\mid Jh_\epsilon(x) \mid^2} \right] dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $K_5(\epsilon) := \dfrac{\epsilon^{2-2\alpha} cos^2(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)}{\mid Jh_\epsilon(x) \mid^2} \to 0$ as $h_\epsilon \to i_\Omega$ in $C^1(\Omega)$. We have the following estimate for the integral (26):

$$\int_\Omega \left| \psi(x) \nabla_\Omega u(x) \cdot \nabla_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{\mid Jh_\epsilon(x) \mid} \right) \right| \mid Jh_\epsilon(x) \mid dx \leq C_2(\epsilon) \left\{ \int_\Omega \psi^2 \, dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \int_\Omega \nabla_\Omega u \cdot \nabla_\Omega u \, dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

with $C_2(\epsilon) := \max_{(x_1,x_2)\in\,]0,1[\times]0,1[} \left\{ \mid Jh_\epsilon(x) \mid \right\} [K_5(\epsilon)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \to 0$ as $h_\epsilon \to i_\Omega$ in $C^1(\Omega)$.

We conclude that

$$\left| \left\langle \left(A_\epsilon - A \right) u \, , \, \psi \right\rangle_{-1,1} \right| \leq C(\epsilon) || \, u \, ||_{H^1(\Omega)} || \, \psi \, ||_{H^1(\Omega)}$$

with $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0+} C(\epsilon) = 0$ (independently of u) and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \| \left(A_\epsilon - A \right) u \|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} &\leq C(\epsilon) || \, u \, ||_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \tau(\epsilon) || \, Au \, ||_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

with $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0+} \tau(\epsilon) = 0$, (and $\tau(\epsilon)$ does not depend on u). Therefore, the result follows from Lemma 1.22. □

Remark 3.10. *From the above proof, it also follows that the sector and the constant M in the resolvent inequality are the same as the ones for A_ϵ, and can be chosen as in (21) and (22).*

4. The abstract problem in a scale of Banach spaces

Our goal in this section is to pose the problem (P_ϵ) in a convenient abstract setting. We proved in Theorem 3.7 that, if ϵ is small, the operator A_ϵ in $L^2(\Omega)$ defined by (9) with domain given in (10) is sectorial as well as its extension $\widetilde{A}_\epsilon$ to $H^{-1}(\Omega)$. It is then well-known that the domains X^α_ϵ (resp. $\widetilde{X}^\alpha_\epsilon$), $\alpha \geq 0$ of the fractional powers of A_ϵ (resp. $\widetilde{A}_\epsilon$) are Banach spaces, $X^0_\epsilon = L^2(\Omega)$, (resp. $\widetilde{X}^0_\epsilon = H^{-1}(\Omega)$), $X^1_\epsilon = D(A_\epsilon)$, (resp. $\widetilde{X}^1_\epsilon = D(\widetilde{A}_\epsilon)$), X^α_ϵ, ($\widetilde{X}^\alpha_\epsilon$) is compactly embedded in X^β_ϵ, ($\widetilde{X}^\beta_\epsilon$) when $\alpha > \beta \geq 0$, and $X^\alpha_\epsilon = H^{2\alpha}$, when 2α is an integer number.

Since $X^{\frac{1}{2}}_\epsilon = \widetilde{X}^1_\epsilon$, it follows easily that $X^{\alpha-\frac{1}{2}}_\epsilon = \widetilde{X}^\alpha_\epsilon$, for $\frac{1}{2} \leq \alpha \leq 1$ and, by an abuse of notation, we will still write $X^{\alpha-\frac{1}{2}}_\epsilon$ instead of $\widetilde{X}^\alpha_\epsilon$, for $0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$ so we may denote by $\{X^\alpha_\epsilon,\ -\frac{1}{2} \leq \alpha \leq 1\} = \{X^\alpha_\epsilon,\ 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1\} \cup \{\widetilde{X}^\alpha_\epsilon,\ 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1\}$, the whole family of fractional power spaces. We will denote simply by X^α the fractional power spaces associated to the unperturbed operator A.

For any $-\dfrac{1}{2} \leq \beta \leq 0$, we may now define an operator in these spaces as the restriction of $\widetilde{A}_\epsilon$. We then have the following result

Theorem 4.1. *For any $-\frac{1}{2} \leq \beta \leq 0$ and ϵ sufficiently small, the operator $(A_\epsilon)_\beta$ in X^β_ϵ, obtained by restricting $\widetilde{A}_\epsilon$, with domain $X^{\beta+1}_\epsilon$ is a sectorial operator.*

Proof. Writing $\beta = -\frac{1}{2} + \delta$, for some $0 \leq \delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we have $(A_\epsilon)_\beta = \widetilde{A}^{-\delta}_\epsilon \widetilde{A}_\epsilon \widetilde{A}^\delta_\epsilon$. Since $\widetilde{A}^\delta_\epsilon$ is an isometry from X^β_ϵ to $X^{-\frac{1}{2}}_\epsilon = H^{-1}(\Omega)$, the result follows easily. □

We now show that the scale of Banach spaces $\{X^\alpha_\epsilon,\ -\frac{1}{2} \leq \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}\} = \{\widetilde{X}^\alpha_\epsilon,\ 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1\}$, do not change when $\epsilon > 0$ varies. More precisely

Theorem 4.2. *For any $-\frac{1}{2} \leq \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$, let $\|u\|_{\epsilon,\alpha}$ denote the norm in $X^\alpha_\epsilon = \widetilde{X}^{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}}_\epsilon$ and $\|u\|_\alpha$ the norm in $X^\alpha = \widetilde{X}^{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}}$. Then, we have $\|u\|_{\epsilon,\alpha} \leq K_1(\epsilon)\|u\|_\alpha \leq K_2(\epsilon)\|u\|_{\epsilon,\alpha}$, with $K_1(\epsilon), K_2(\epsilon) \to 1$ as $\epsilon \to 0$, uniformly in α. In particular, $X^\alpha_\epsilon = X^\alpha$, with equivalent norms, uniformly in ϵ.*

Proof. As observed above, using the same arguments of Theorems 3.5 and 3.6, we prove that $\widetilde{A}_\epsilon$ is self-adjoint with respect to the usual inner product in $H^1(\Omega)$. Similarly, one can prove that $\widetilde{A}_\epsilon$ is self-adjoint with respect to the inner product with "weight" $|Jh_\epsilon|$. It then follows, from well-known results, that the fractional powers of order α of these operators coincide isometricaly with the interpolation spaces $[D(\widetilde{A}), H^{-1}(\Omega)]_\alpha$, $[D(\widetilde{A}_\epsilon), H^{-1}(\Omega)]_\alpha$ respectively (see, for instance, Theorem 16.1 of [15]). Let $I : X \to Y$ denote the inclusion operator from $X \subset Y$ to Y and by $\|I\|_{\mathcal{L}(X,Y)}$ its norm as a linear operator. From Theorem 1.15 of [15] we then have, for any $u \in D(\widetilde{A}_\epsilon)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|I\|_{\mathcal{L}([D(\widetilde{A}),H^{-1}(\Omega)]_\alpha\,,\,[D(\widetilde{A}_\epsilon),H^{-1}(\Omega)]_\alpha)} &\leq \|I\|^{(1-\alpha)}_{\mathcal{L}(H^{-1}(\Omega)\,,\,H^{-1}(\Omega))}\|I\|^\alpha_{\mathcal{L}(D(\widetilde{A})\,,\,D(\widetilde{A}_\epsilon))} \\ &\leq \|I\|^\alpha_{\mathcal{L}(D(\widetilde{A})\,,\,D(\widetilde{A}_\epsilon))}, \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Now, from (27) it follows that $\|Iu\|_{D(\widetilde{A}_\epsilon)} = \|u\|_{D(\widetilde{A}_\epsilon)} = \|\widetilde{A}_\epsilon u\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \leq (1+\tau(\epsilon))\|\widetilde{A}u\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} = (1+\tau(\epsilon))\|u\|_{D(\widetilde{A})}$, where $\tau(\epsilon) \to 0$, uniformly for $u \in D(\widetilde{A})$. Thus $\|I\|_{\mathcal{L}(D(\widetilde{A})\,,\,D(\widetilde{A}_\epsilon))} \leq (1+\tau(\epsilon))$ as $\epsilon \to 0$ and it follows from (28) that

$$\|u\|_{[D(\widetilde{A}_\epsilon)\,,\,H^{-1}(\Omega)]_\alpha} \leq (1+\tau(\epsilon))^\alpha \|u\|_{[D(\widetilde{A})\,,\,H^{-1}(\Omega)]_\alpha},$$

as $\epsilon \to 0$. The reverse inequality follows similarly. □

Using the results of Theorem 4.1 and 4.2, we can now pose the problem (8) as an abstract problem in a (fixed) scale of Banach spaces $\{X^\beta,\, -\frac{1}{2} \leq \beta \leq 0\}$.

$$\begin{cases} u_t + (A_\epsilon)_\beta u = (H_\epsilon)_\beta u\,,\; t > t_0\,; \\ u(t_0) = u_0 \in X^\eta\,, \end{cases} \tag{29}$$

where

$$(H_\epsilon)_\beta = H(\cdot,\epsilon) := (F_\epsilon)_\beta + (G_\epsilon)_\beta : X^\eta \to X^\beta, \quad \epsilon > 0 \text{ and } 0 \leq \eta \leq \beta + 1, \tag{30}$$

(i) $(F_\epsilon)_\beta = F(\cdot,\epsilon) : X^\eta \to X^\beta$ is given by

$$\langle F(u,\epsilon)\,,\,\Phi\rangle_{\beta\,,\,-\beta} = \int_\Omega f(u)\,\Phi\,dx, \quad \text{for any } \Phi \in X^{-\beta}, \tag{31}$$

(ii) $(G_\epsilon)_\beta = G(\cdot,\epsilon) : X^\eta \to X^\beta$ is given by

$$\langle G(u,\epsilon)\,,\,\Phi\rangle_{\beta\,,\,-\beta} = \int_{\partial\Omega} g(\gamma(u))\,\gamma(\Phi)\left|\frac{J_{\partial\Omega}h_\epsilon}{Jh_\epsilon}\right| d\sigma(x)\,, \quad \text{for any } \Phi \in X^{-\beta}, \tag{32}$$

where γ is the trace map and $J_{\partial\Omega}h_\epsilon$ is the determinant of the Jacobian matrix of the diffeomorphism $h_\epsilon : \partial\Omega \longrightarrow \partial h_\epsilon(\Omega)$.

5. Local well-posedness

In order to prove local well-posedness for the abstract problem (29), we will need the following growth conditions for the functions $f, g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$:

(1) f is in $C^1(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$ and there exist real numbers $\lambda_1 > 0$ e $L_1 > 0$ such that

$$|\,f(u_1) - f(u_2)\,| \leq L_1\,(1 + |\,u_1\,|^{\lambda_1} + |\,u_2\,|^{\lambda_1})|\,u_1 - u_2\,|, \text{ for all } u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{33}$$

(2) g is in $C^2(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$ and there exists a real number $\lambda_2 > 0$ e $L_2 > 0$ such that

$$|\,g(u_1) - g(u_2)\,| \leq L_2\,(1 + |\,u_1\,|^{\lambda_2} + |\,u_2\,|^{\lambda_2})|\,u_1 - u_2\,| \text{ for all } u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{34}$$

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that f satisfies the growth condition (33) and $\eta > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2(\lambda_1+1)}$. Then, the operator $(F_\epsilon)_\beta = F : X^\eta \to X^\beta$ given by (31) is well defined, and bounded in bounded sets.*

Proof. If $u \in X^\eta$ and $\Phi \in X^{-\beta}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \langle F(u\,,\,\epsilon)\,,\,\Phi\rangle_{\beta,-\beta} \right| &\leq \int_\Omega |\, f(u)\,|\,|\,\Phi\,|\,dx \\
&\leq L_1 \int_\Omega |\,u\,|\,|\,\Phi\,|\,dx + L_1 \int_\Omega |\,u\,|^{\lambda_1+1}\,|\,\Phi\,|\,dx + \int_\Omega |\,f(0)\,|\,|\,\Phi\,|\,dx \\
&\leq L_1||u||_{L^2(\Omega)}||\Phi||_{L^2(\Omega)} + L_1||u^{\lambda_1+1}||_{L^2(\Omega)}||\Phi||_{L^2(\Omega)} + ||f(0)||_{L^2(\Omega)}||\Phi||_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= L_1||u||_{L^2(\Omega)}||\Phi||_{L^2(\Omega)} + L_1||u||^{\lambda_1+1}_{L^{2(\lambda_1+1)}(\Omega)}||\Phi||_{L^2(\Omega)} + ||f(0)||_{L^2(\Omega)}||\Phi||_{L^2(\Omega)}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 1.21 we have $X^{-\beta} \subset L^2(\Omega)$, $X^\eta \subset L^2(\Omega)$ and $X^\eta \subset L^{2(\lambda_1+1)}(\Omega)$, with embedding constants K_1, K_2 and K_3, respectively. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \langle F(u,\epsilon)\,,\,\Phi\rangle_{\beta\,,-\beta} \right| &\leq L_1K_1K_2||\,u\,||_{X^\eta}||\,\Phi\,||_{X^{-\beta}} + L_1K_1K_3^{\lambda_1+1}||\,u\,||^{\lambda_1+1}_{X^\eta}||\,\Phi\,||_{X^{-\beta}} \\
&\quad + K_1||\,f(0)\,||_{L^2(\Omega)}||\,\Phi\,||_{X^{-\beta}}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $u \in X^\eta$ and $\Phi \in X^{-\beta}$, we have

$$\left|\left|\,F(u,\epsilon)\,\right|\right|_{X^\beta} \leq L_1K_1K_2||\,u\,||_{X^\eta} + L_1K_1K_3^{\lambda_1+1}||\,u\,||^{\lambda_1+1}_{X^\eta} + K_1||\,f(0)\,||_{L^2(\Omega)}\,,$$

which concludes the proof. □

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose that f satisfies the growth condition (33) and let p and q be conjugated exponents, with $\frac{1}{\lambda_1} < p < \infty$. Then, if $\eta > \max\left\{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p\lambda_1}, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2q}\right\}$, the operator $F(u,\epsilon) = F(u) : X^\eta \times \mathbb{R} \to X^\beta$ given by (31) is locally Lipschitz continuous in u.*

Proof. If $u_1, u_2 \in X^\eta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\langle F(u_1,\epsilon) - F(u_2,\epsilon)\,,\,\Phi\rangle_{\beta,-\beta}\right| &= \left|\int_\Omega [f(u_1) - f(u_2)]\,\Phi\,dx\right| \\
&\leq \int_\Omega L_1(1 + |\,u_1\,|^{\lambda_1} + |\,u_2\,|^{\lambda_1})\,|\,u_1 - u_2\,|\,|\,\Phi\,|\,dx \\
&\leq L_1\left\{\int_\Omega (1 + |u_1|^{\lambda_1} + |u_2|^{\lambda_1})^{\,2}|u_1 - u_2|^2 dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\left\{\int_\Omega |\,\Phi\,|^2 dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq L_1\left\{\int_\Omega (1 + |\,u_1\,|^{\lambda_1} + |\,u_2\,|^{\lambda_1})^{\,2p}\right\}^{\frac{1}{2p}}\left\{\int_\Omega |\,u_1 - u_2\,|^{2q} dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\
&\quad \cdot\left\{\int_\Omega |\,\Phi\,|^2 dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= L_1||\,1 + |\,u_1\,|^{\lambda_1} + |\,u_2\,|^{\lambda_1}\,||_{L^{2p}(\Omega)}\,||\,u_1 - u_2\,||_{L^{2q}(\Omega)}||\,\Phi\,||_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq L_1\big(|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2p}} + ||u_1^{\lambda_1}||_{L^{2p}(\Omega)} + ||u_2^{\lambda_1}||_{L^{2p}(\Omega)}\big)\,||u_1 - u_2||_{L^{2q}(\Omega)}||\,\Phi\,||_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= L_1\big(|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2p}} + ||u_1||^{\lambda_1}_{L^{2p\lambda_1}(\Omega)} + ||u_2||^{\lambda_1}_{L^{2p\lambda_1}(\Omega)}\big)||u_1 - u_2||_{L^{2q}(\Omega)}||\Phi||_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq L_1\big(\,|\,\Omega\,|^{\frac{1}{2p}} + K_4^{\lambda_1}||\,u_1\,||^{\lambda_1}_{X^\eta} + K_4^{\lambda_1}||\,u_2\,||^{\lambda_1}_{X^\eta}\big) \\
&\quad \cdot K_5||\,u_1 - u_2\,||_{X^\eta}K_1||\,\Phi\,||_{X^{-\beta}}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where $|\,\Omega\,|$ is the measure of Ω.

By Theorem 1.21 we have $X^{-\beta} \subset L^2(\Omega)$, $X^\eta \subset L^{2p\lambda_1}(\Omega)$, and $X^\eta \subset L^{2q}(\Omega)$, with embedding constants K_1, K_4 and K_5, respectively. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \langle F(u_1,\epsilon) - F(u_2,\epsilon)\,,\,\Phi\rangle_{\beta\,,-\beta} \right| \;&\leq\; L_1\big(\,|\,\Omega\,|^{\frac{1}{2p}} + K_4^{\lambda_1}||\,u_1\,||_{X^\eta}^{\lambda_1} + K_4^{\lambda_1}||\,u_2\,||_{X^\eta}^{\lambda_1}\big)\\ &\quad\cdot K_5||\,u_1-u_2\,||_{X^\eta} K_1||\,\Phi\,||_{X^{-\beta}}\,.\end{aligned}$$

If U is a bounded subset of X^η and $u_1,\,u_2 \in U$, we have

$$||\,F(u_1\,,\,\epsilon) - F(u_2\,,\,\epsilon)\,||_{X^\beta} \leq K_{\lambda_1\,,U}\,||\,u_1-u_2\,||_{X^\eta},$$

where $K_{\lambda_1\,,U}$ is a positive constant depending on λ_1 and U. This concludes the proof. □

For the regularity properties of $(G_\epsilon)_\beta$ we will need to compute the function

$$\theta(x,\epsilon) := \left| \frac{J_{\partial\Omega} h_\epsilon}{Jh_\epsilon}(x) \right|,\; x=(x_1,x_2)\in\mathbb{R}^2,$$

in each of the four segments of $\partial\Omega$. For $I_1 := \{(x_1,1)\,|\,0\leq x_1\leq 1\}$, we have $h_\epsilon(x_1,1) = (x_1, 1+\epsilon\,sen(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha))$, so $\frac{d}{dx_1}h_\epsilon(x_1,1) = Dh_\epsilon(x_1,1)\cdot(1,0) = (1,\epsilon^{1-\alpha}\cos(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha))$. Therefore the restriction of h_ϵ to I_1 takes the unit vector $(1,0)$ tangent to I_1 to the vector $(1,\epsilon^{1-\alpha}\cos(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha))$. It follows that $\|Dh_{\epsilon\,|I_1}(x_1,1)\| = |J_{\partial\Omega}h_\epsilon(x_1,1)| = \sqrt{1+\epsilon^{\,2-2\alpha}cos^{\,2}(x_1/\epsilon^{\,\alpha})}$.

Thus

$$\theta(x,\epsilon) \;:=\; \frac{\sqrt{1+\epsilon^{\,2-2\alpha}cos^{\,2}(x_1/\epsilon^{\,\alpha})}}{1+\epsilon\sin(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)},\ \text{for } x\in I_1. \tag{35}$$

Similar computations give

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(x,\epsilon) \;&:=\; \frac{1+\epsilon\sin(1/\epsilon^\alpha)}{1+\epsilon\sin(1/\epsilon^\alpha)} = 1 \text{ for } x\in I_2 := \{(1,x_2)\,|\,0\leq x_2\leq 1\}\,,\\ \theta(x,\epsilon) \;&:=\; \frac{1}{1+\epsilon\sin(x_1/\epsilon^\alpha)} \text{ for } x\in I_3 := \{(x_1,0)\,|\,0\leq x_1\leq 1\}\,,\\ \theta(x,\epsilon) \;&:=\; \frac{1}{1} = 1 \text{ for } x\in I_4 := \{(0,x_2)\,|\,0\leq x_2\leq 1\}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that g satisfies the growth condition (34), $\eta > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4(\lambda_2+1)}$, $\beta < -\frac{1}{4}$ and $\epsilon_0 < 1$. Then, the operator $(G_\epsilon)_\beta = G : X^\eta \to X^\beta$ given by (32) is well defined, for $0\leq\epsilon<\epsilon_0$ and bounded in bounded sets, uniformly in ϵ.*

Proof. If $u \in X^\eta$ and $\Phi \in X^{-\beta}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \langle G(u,\epsilon)\,,\,\Phi\rangle_{\beta\,,-\beta} \right| &\leq \int_{\partial\Omega} |\, g(\gamma(u))\,|\,|\,\gamma(\Phi)\,| \left| \frac{J_{\partial\Omega} h_\epsilon}{J h_\epsilon} \right| d\sigma(x) \\
&\leq ||\theta||_\infty \int_{\partial\Omega} L_2 \big[|\gamma(u)| + |\gamma(u)|^{\lambda_2+1} \big] |\gamma(\Phi)| + |g(\gamma(0))|\,|\gamma(\Phi)|\, d\sigma(x) \\
&\leq ||\,\theta\,||_\infty L_2 \left(\int_{\partial\Omega} |\,\gamma(u)\,|^2 d\sigma(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\partial\Omega} |\,\gamma(\Phi)\,|^2 d\sigma(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + ||\,\theta\,||_\infty L_2 \left(\int_{\partial\Omega} |\,\gamma(u)\,|^{2(\lambda_2+1)} d\sigma(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\partial\Omega} |\,\gamma(\Phi)\,|^2 d\sigma(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + ||\,\theta\,||_\infty ||\,g(\gamma(0))\,||_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\, ||\,\gamma(\Phi)\,||_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
&= ||\,\theta\,||_\infty L_2 \left[||\,\gamma(u)\,||_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} + ||\,\gamma(u)\,||^{\lambda_2+1}_{L^{2(\lambda_2+1)}(\partial\Omega)} \right] ||\,\gamma(\Phi)\,||_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
&\quad + ||\,\theta\,||_\infty ||\,g(\gamma(0))\,||_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\, ||\,\gamma(\Phi)\,||_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\|\theta\|_\infty = \sup\{|\theta(x,\epsilon)|\,|\,x \in \partial\Omega,\, 0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0\}$ is finite by (35) and (36). If $s = 2\eta$, then $X^\eta \subset H^s(\Omega)$, by Theorem 1.21 and $\gamma : H^s(\Omega) \mapsto L^{2(\lambda_2+1)}(\partial\Omega)$, by Theorem 1.10. Thus, we obtain $||\gamma(\Phi)||_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq \overline{K}_1\, ||\Phi||_{X^{-\beta}}$, $||\gamma(u)||_{L^{2(\lambda_2+1)}(\partial\Omega)} \leq \overline{K}_2\, ||u||_{X^\eta}$, $||\gamma(u)||_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq \overline{K}_3\, ||u||_{X^\eta}$, where $\overline{K}_1$, $\overline{K}_2$ and $\overline{K}_3$ are embedding constants. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\big|\, G(u,\epsilon)\,\big|\big|_{X^\beta} &\leq L_2 \overline{K}_3 \overline{K}_1 ||\,\theta\,||_\infty ||\,u\,||_{X^\eta} + L_2 \overline{K}_2^{\lambda_2+1} \overline{K}_1 ||\,\theta\,||_\infty ||\,u\,||_{X^\eta} \\
&\quad + \overline{K}_1 ||\,\theta||_\infty ||\,g(\gamma(0))\,||_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

proving that $(G_\epsilon)_\beta$ is well defined. □

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose that g satisfies the growth condition (34) and let p and q be conjugated exponents, with $\frac{1}{2\lambda_2} < p < \infty$ and $\epsilon_0 < 1$. Then, if $\eta > \max\left\{ \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4p\lambda_2}, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4q} \right\}$ and $\beta < -\frac{1}{4}$, the operator $G(u,\epsilon) = G(u) : X^\eta \times [0,\epsilon_0] \to X^\beta$ given by (32) is uniformly continuous in ϵ, for u in bounded sets of X^η and locally Lipschitz continuous in u, uniformly in ϵ.*

Proof. We first show that $(G_\epsilon)_\beta$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in $u \in X^\eta$. Let $u_1, u_2 \in X^\eta$, $\Phi \in X^{-\beta}$ and $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\langle G(u_1,\epsilon) - G(u_2,\epsilon), \Phi\rangle_{\beta,-\beta}\right| &\leq \int_{\partial\Omega} |\, g(\gamma(u_1)) - g(\gamma(u_2))\,|\,|\,\gamma(\Phi)\,|\left|\frac{J_{\partial\Omega}h_\epsilon}{Jh_\epsilon}\right| d\sigma(x)\\
&\leq \int_{\partial\Omega} L_2\big(1 + |\gamma(u_1)|^{\lambda_2} + |\gamma(u_2)|^{\lambda_2}\big)|\gamma(u_1) - \gamma(u_2)|\,|\gamma(\Phi)|\left|\frac{J_{\partial\Omega}h_\epsilon}{Jh_\epsilon}\right| d\sigma(x)\\
&\leq L_2||\theta||_\infty \int_{\partial\Omega} \big(1 + |\gamma(u_1)|^{\lambda_2} + |\gamma(u_2)|^{\lambda_2}\big)|\gamma(u_1) - \gamma(u_2)|\,|\gamma(\Phi)|\; d\sigma(x)\\
&\leq L_2||\theta||_\infty \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} \left(1 + |\gamma(u_1)|^{\lambda_2} + |\gamma(u_2)|^{\lambda_2}\right)^2 |\gamma(u_1) - \gamma(u_2)|^2\, d\sigma(x)\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\cdot \quad \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} |\,\gamma(\Phi)\,|^2\; d\sigma(x)\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\leq L_2||\,\theta\,||_\infty \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} \left(1 + |\,\gamma(u_1)\,|^{\lambda_2} + |\,\gamma(u_2)\,|^{\lambda_2}\right)^{2p} d\sigma(x)\right\}^{\frac{1}{2p}}\\
&\cdot \quad \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} |\,\gamma(u_1) - \gamma(u_2)\,|^{2q} d\sigma(x)]\right\}^{\frac{1}{2q}} ||\,\gamma(\Phi)\,||_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\\
&\leq L_2||\,\theta\,||_\infty\big(\,|\,\partial\Omega\,|^{\frac{1}{2p}} + ||\,\gamma(u_1)\,||^{\lambda_2}_{L^{2p\lambda_2}(\partial\Omega)} + ||\,\gamma(u_2)\,||^{\lambda_2}_{L^{2p\lambda_2}(\partial\Omega)}\big)\\
&\cdot \quad ||\,\gamma(u_1) - \gamma(u_2)\,||_{L^{2q}(\partial\Omega)}||\,\gamma(\Phi)\,||_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where $|\,\partial\Omega\,|$ is the measure of $\partial\Omega$, $1 < p, q < \infty$ are conjugated exponents with $p > \dfrac{1}{2\lambda_2}$ and $\|\theta\|_\infty = \sup\{|\theta(x,\epsilon)|\,|\,x \in \Omega,\, 0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0\}$. Reasoning as in Lemma 5.3, we obtain the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned}
||\,\gamma(\Phi)\,||_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} &\leq \overline{K}_1\,||\,\Phi\,||_{X^{-\beta}}\,,\\
||\,\gamma(u)\,||_{L^{2p\lambda_2}(\partial\Omega)} &\leq \overline{K}_4\,||\,u\,||_{X^\eta}\,,\\
||\,\gamma(u)\,||_{L^{2q}(\partial\Omega)} &\leq \overline{K}_5\,||\,u\,||_{X^\eta}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{K}_1$, $\overline{K}_4$ e $\overline{K}_5$ are embedding constants. Thus, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\,\langle G(u_1,\epsilon) - G(u_2,\epsilon)\,,\,\Phi\rangle_{\beta\,,-\beta}\,\right| &\leq L_2||\,\theta\,||_\infty\big(\,|\,\partial\Omega\,|^{\frac{1}{2p}} + \overline{K}_4^{\lambda_2}||\,u_1\,||^{\lambda_2}_{X^\eta} + \overline{K}_4^{\lambda_2}||\,u_2\,||^{\lambda_2}_{X^\eta}\big)\\
&\quad \cdot \overline{K}_5||\,u_1 - u_2\,||_{X^\eta}\overline{K}_1||\,\Phi\,||_{X^{-\beta}}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

If U is a bounded subset of X^η, u_1, $u_2 \in U$, we have

$$||\,G(u_1,\epsilon) - G(u_2,\epsilon)\,||_{X^\beta} \leq \overline{K}_{\lambda_2\,,U}\,||\,u_1 - u_2\,||_{X^\eta}\,,$$

where $\overline{K}_{\lambda_2\,,U}$ is a positive constant depending on λ_2 and U. Therefore, $(G_\epsilon)_\beta$ is locally Lipschitz in u.

Now, if $u \in X^\eta$, $\Phi \in X^{-\beta}$ and $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \in [0, \epsilon_0]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\langle G(u,\epsilon_1) - G(u,\epsilon_2), \Phi\rangle_{\beta,-\beta}\right| &\leq \int_{\partial\Omega} |\,\gamma(g(u))\,|\,|\,\gamma(\Phi)\,|\left|\left(\left|\frac{J_{\partial\Omega}h_{\epsilon_1}}{Jh_{\epsilon_1}}\right| - \left|\frac{J_{\partial\Omega}h_{\epsilon_2}}{Jh_{\epsilon_2}}\right|\right)\right| d\sigma(x)\\
&\leq \|\theta_{\epsilon_1} - \theta_{\epsilon_2}\|_\infty \int_{\partial\Omega} |\,g(\gamma(u))\,|\,|\,\gamma(\Phi)\,|\,d\sigma(x),
\end{aligned}$$

and $\|\theta_{\epsilon_1} - \theta_{\epsilon_2}\|_\infty = \sup\{|\theta(x,\epsilon_1) - \theta(x,\epsilon_1)| \,|\, x \in \Omega, \} \to 0$ as $|\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2| \to 0$, by (35) and (36). □

Theorem 5.5. *Suppose f and g satisfy the growth conditions (33) and (34), respectively. Suppose also, that β and η satisfy the hypotheses of Lemmas 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, $\eta < 1 + \beta$ and $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. Then, for any $(t_0, u_0) \in \mathbb{R} \times X^\eta$, the problem (29) has a unique solution $u(t, t_0, u_0, \epsilon)$ with initial value $u(t_0) = u_0$. The map $\epsilon \mapsto u(t, t_0, u_0, \epsilon) \in X^\eta$ is continuous at $\epsilon = \epsilon_0$, uniformly for u_0 in bounded sets of X^η and $t_0 \le t \le T < \infty$.*

Proof. From Theorem 4.1 it follows that $(A_\epsilon)_\beta$ is a sectorial operator in X^β_ϵ, with domain $X^{1+\beta}_\epsilon$, if ϵ is small enough. From Lemmas 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 it follows that $(H_\epsilon)_\beta$ is well defined and locally Lipschitz continuous in X^η, and bounded in bounded sets of X^η. The result follows then from Theorems 1.25 and 1.32. □

6. Lyapunov functionals and global existence

We now want to show that the solutions given by Theorem 5.5 are globally defined, if a additional (dissipative) hypotheses on f and g is assumed. We start by stating these hypotheses:

There exist constants c_0, d_0 and d_0' such that

$$\limsup_{|u|\to\infty} \frac{f(u)}{u} \le c_0\,, \quad \limsup_{|u|\to\infty} \frac{g(u)}{u} \le d_0' \tag{37}$$

and, if $d_0 > d_0'$, the first eigenvalue μ_1 of the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (a - c_0)u = \mu u \text{ em } \Omega \\ \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial N_\Omega} = d_0\, u \text{ em } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{38}$$

is positive.

Remark 6.1. *Observe that the hypotheses (37) and (38) still hold for the perturbed operator $h^*_\epsilon \Delta_{\Omega_\epsilon} h^{*-1}_\epsilon$, with perturbed boundary conditions $h^*_\epsilon \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial N_{\Omega_\epsilon}} h^{*-1}_\epsilon$, if ϵ is small enough, since the eigenvalues change continuously with ϵ by (27).*

In order to prove global existence, we work first in the natural "energy space" $H^1(\Omega)$, that is we choose $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$ (and $\beta < -\frac{1}{4}$). It is also convenient to work first in the *perturbed domain* Ω_ϵ. More precisely, we consider initially the following abstract version of problem (P_ϵ) in the Banach space Y^β, where Y^α, $-\frac{1}{2} \le \alpha \le 1$, now denote the fractional powers of the operator $-\Delta_{\Omega_\epsilon} + aI$ in the perturbed domain Ω_ϵ,

$$\begin{cases} v_t + A_\beta v = H_\beta v\,,\ t > t_0\,; \\ v(t_0) = v_0 \in H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)\,, \end{cases} \tag{39}$$

where $H_\beta := F_\beta + G_\beta : H^1(\Omega_\epsilon) \to X^\beta$, $\epsilon > 0$,

(i) $F_\beta : H^1(\Omega_\epsilon) \to X^\beta$ is given by

$$\langle F(v)\,,\,\Psi\rangle_{\beta\,,-\beta} = \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} f(v)\,\Psi\,dy, \quad \text{for any } \Psi \in Y^{-\beta},$$

(ii) $G_\beta : H^1(\Omega_\epsilon) \to X^\beta$ is given by

$$\langle G(v)\,,\,\Psi\rangle_{\beta\,,-\beta} = \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} g(\gamma(v))\,\gamma(\Psi)\left|\frac{J_{\partial\Omega}h_\epsilon}{Jh_\epsilon}\right| d\sigma(y)\,, \quad \text{for any } \Psi \in Y^{-\beta},$$

where γ is the trace map.

It is not difficult to show that v is a solution of (39) if and only if $u = v \circ h_\epsilon$ is a solution of (29), with $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, the local well-posedness of (39) follows immediately from Theorem 5.5.

We now prove the existence of a Lyapunov functional for the dynamical system generated by (39).

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose that the hypotheses of Theorem 5.5 are satisfied, with $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$ and, additionally, that f and g satisfy the dissipative conditions (37) and (38) and consider the map*

$$\begin{array}{rccl} W_\epsilon : & H^1(\Omega_\epsilon) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R} \\ & v & \longmapsto & W_\epsilon(v) = \dfrac{1}{2}\displaystyle\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\,\nabla v\,|^2 dx + \frac{a}{2}\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\,v\,|^2 dx - \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} F(v)\,dx - \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} G(\gamma(v))\,dS \end{array}$$

where a is a positive number and $F, G : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are primitives of f and g respectively. Then, if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, W_ϵ is a Lyapunov functional for the problem (39) and there constants $K_1(\epsilon)$ and $K_2(\epsilon)$ such that $W_\epsilon(v) \le K_1(\epsilon)\|v\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)} + K_2(\epsilon)$, for any $v \in H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$.

Proof. If v is a solution of (39) in $H^2(\Omega)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}W_\epsilon(v(t)) &= \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\,\nabla v\,|^2 dx + \frac{a}{2}\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\,v\,|^2 dx - \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} F(v)\,dx - \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} G(\gamma(v))\,dS\right) \\ &= \int_{\Omega_\epsilon}\left(\frac{d}{dx}v_t\right)\nabla v\,dx + a\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} v_t v\,dx - \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} v_t f(v)\,dx - \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} v_t g(\gamma(v))\,dS \\ &= -\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} v_t\Delta v\,dx + \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} v_t\frac{\partial v}{\partial N}dS + a\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} v_t v\,dx - \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} v_t f(v)\,dx - \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} v_t g(\gamma(v))\,dS \\ &= -\left(\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} v_t\Delta v\,dx - a\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} v_t v\,dx + \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} v_t f(v)\,dx\right) \\ &= -\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\,v_t\,|^2 dx \\ &= -||\,v_t\,||^2_{L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

The equality $\dfrac{d}{dt}W_\epsilon(v(t)) = -||\,v_t\,||^2_{L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)}$ is established, supposing that v is a solution in $H^2(\Omega)$. But, since both sides are well defined and continuous functions of $v \in X^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$, it remains true for any solution. Therefore W_ϵ is decreasing along the solutions of (39). It is clear from its formula, that W_ϵ is continuous. We now want to obtain an estimate for $W_\epsilon(v)$

in terms of the norm of $v \in H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$. From (37), there exist $\epsilon_f > 0$ and $M(\epsilon_f) > 0$ such that $\dfrac{f(s)}{s} - c_0 \leq \epsilon_f$ for $|\, s \,| > M(\epsilon_f)$. Therefore, if $s > 0$ we have

$$\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} F(v)\, dx = \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} \left(\int_0^v f(s)\, ds \right) dx \leq \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} \left(\int_0^v (c_0 s + \epsilon_f s)\, ds \right) dx \leq \frac{c_0}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, v \,|^2 dx + k_0\,,$$

where k_0 depends on ϵ_f, $M(\epsilon_f)$ and the first eigenvalue of (38). A similar argument gives the same estimate for $s < 0$.

Now, from (37) there exist $\epsilon_g > 0$ and $N(\epsilon_g) > 0$ such that $\dfrac{g(s)}{s} - d_0' \leq \epsilon_g$ for $|\, s \,| > N(\epsilon_g)$. If $s > 0$ we have $g(s) \leq d_0' s + \epsilon_g s\,.$ Therefore

$$\int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} G(\gamma(v)) dS = \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} \left(\int_0^v g(s) ds \right) dS \leq \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} \left(\int_0^v (d_0' s + \epsilon_g s) ds \right) dS \leq \frac{d_0'}{2} \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} |\gamma(v)|^2 dS + k_0'\,,$$

where k_0' depends on ϵ_g, $N(\epsilon_g)$ and the first eigenvalue of (38). We obtain a similar estimate for $s < 0$.

Using these estimates, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} W_\epsilon(v) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, \nabla v \,|^2 dx + \frac{a}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, v \,|^2 dx + \frac{c_0}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, v \,|^2 dx + k_0 + \frac{d_0'}{2} \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} |\, \gamma(v) \,|^2 dS + k_0' \\ &\leq K_1(\epsilon) \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)} + K_2(\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} W_\epsilon(v) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, \nabla v \,|^2 dx + \frac{a}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, v \,|^2 dx - \frac{c_0}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, v \,|^2 dx - k_0 - \frac{d_0'}{2} \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} |\, \gamma(v) \,|^2 dS - k_0' \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, \nabla v \,|^2 dx + \frac{(a - c_0)}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, v \,|^2 dx - \frac{d_0'}{2} \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} |\, \gamma(v) \,|^2 dS - (k_0 + k_0'), \end{aligned}$$

and, since $d_0 > d_0'$, we may choose $d_0'' \neq 0$ such that

$$d_0 > d_0'' > d_0' \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{d_0}{d_0''} - 1 \right) \frac{a - c_0}{2} + \frac{\lambda_0}{2} > 0,$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} W_\epsilon(v) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, \nabla v \,|^2 dx + \frac{(a - c_0)}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, v \,|^2 dx - \frac{d_0''}{2} \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} |\, \gamma(v) \,|^2 dS - (k_0 + k_0') \\ &= \frac{d_0''}{d_0} \left[\frac{d_0}{d_0''} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, \nabla v \,|^2 dx + \frac{d_0}{d_0''} \frac{(a - c_0)}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, v \,|^2 dx - \frac{d_0}{2} \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} |\, \gamma(v) \,|^2 dS - \frac{d_0}{d_0''} (k_0 + k_0') \right] \\ &= \frac{d_0''}{d_0} \left[\left(\frac{d_0}{d_0''} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, \nabla v \,|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, \nabla v \,|^2 dx + \left(\frac{d_0}{d_0''} - 1 \right) \frac{(a - c_0)}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, v \,|^2 dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{(a - c_0)}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, v \,|^2 dx - \frac{d_0}{2} \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} |\, \gamma(v) \,|^2 dS - \frac{d_0''}{d_0} (k_0 + k_0') \right] \\ &\geq \frac{d_0''}{d_0} \left\{ \left(\frac{d_0}{d_0''} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\nabla v|^2 dx + \left[\left(\frac{d_0}{d_0''} - 1 \right) \frac{(a - c_0)}{2} + \frac{\lambda_0}{2} \right] \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |v|^2 dx - \frac{d_0''}{d_0} (k_0 + k_0') \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

From this estimate, we see that $W_\epsilon(v)$ is bounded below by a constant times $||\, v\,||_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)}$ plus a constant depending on the first eigenvalue of (38) and the nonlinearities. Thus $|\, W_\epsilon(v)\,| \to \infty$ as $||\, v\,||_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)} \to \infty$. Finally, if $v(t)$ is a solution defined for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $W_\epsilon(v(t)) = W_\epsilon(v_0)$, with $v_0 \in H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} W_\epsilon(v(t)) = \frac{d}{dt} W_\epsilon(v_0) \Longrightarrow - ||\, v_t\,||^2_{L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)} = 0\,,$$

so v must be an equilibrium of (39).

Therefore W_ϵ is a Lyapunov function for the flow generated by (39), as claimed. □

The Lyapunov functionals W_ϵ in the perturbed regions Ω_ϵ approach the functional $W = W_0$, in $\Omega_0 := \Omega$ when $\epsilon \to 0$ in the following sense:

Lemma 6.3. *If $W_\epsilon : H^1(\Omega_\epsilon) \to \mathbb{R}$ is as in Lemma 6.2, then*

$$K_1(h_\epsilon)|\, W(u)\,| \le |\, W_\epsilon(u \circ h_\epsilon^{-1})\,| \le K_2(h_\epsilon)|\, W(u)\,| \;\; \forall\, u \in H^1(\Omega),$$

with $K_1(h_\epsilon), K_2(h_\epsilon) \to 1$ when $\epsilon \to 0$.

Proof. The result was proved in [11] in the case where $h_\epsilon \to i_\Omega$ in $\mathcal{C}^2$. However, since the inequalities involve only first order derivatives the extension $\mathcal{C}^1$ is immediate. □

We now define a functional $V_\epsilon : H^1(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$V_\epsilon(u) = W_\epsilon(u \circ h_\epsilon^{-1})\,. \tag{40}$$

Lemma 6.4. *The functional V_ϵ defined by (40) is a Lyapunov functional for (29), with $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$ and $-\frac{1}{2} < \beta < -\frac{1}{4}$, and the following estimates hold:*

(1) $K_1 \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} - K_2 \le V_\epsilon(u) \le K_1 \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + K_2$, for some constants K_1 and K_2,

(2) $K_1(h_\epsilon)|\, V(u)\,| \le |\, V_\epsilon(u)\,| \le K_2(h_\epsilon)|\, V(u)\,| \;\; \forall\, u \in H^1(\Omega)$, with $K_1(h_\epsilon), K_2(h_\epsilon) \to 1$ when $\epsilon \to 0$.

Proof. The required properties for V_ϵ follow easily from the properties of W_ϵ and the fact that $h_\epsilon^{*-1} : H^1(\Omega) \to H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ is an isomorphism and takes solutions of (29) into solutions of (39). □

Using the properties of the Lyapunov functional V_ϵ, we now prove the following result of global existence for (29):

Theorem 6.5. *Suppose that β, η, f and g satisfy the conditions of Theorem 5.5 and, additionally, that f and g satisfy the dissipative conditions (37) and (38). Then if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small the solutions of (29) are globally defined.*

Proof. We first consider the case $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$. From Theorem 5.5, for each $(t_0, u_0) \in \mathbb{R} \times H^1(\Omega)$, there exists $T = T(t_0, u_0) > 0$ such that the problem (29) has a unique solution u in $(t_0, t_0 + T)$, with $u(t_0) = u_0$. From Lemmas 5.2 and 5.4 it follows that $(H_\epsilon)_\beta$ is locally Lipschitz, so it takes bounded sets in $X^\eta = H^1(\Omega)$, into bounded sets of in X^β. Suppose that $T < \infty$. Then, by Theorem 1.26 there exists a sequence $t_n \to T^-$ such that $||\, u(t_n)\,||_{H^1(\Omega)} \to \infty$, and thus $|V_\epsilon(u(t_n))| \to \infty$, which is a contradiction with the fact that V_ϵ is decreasing along orbits.

Now, suppose that $\eta = \eta_0 < \frac{1}{2}$, and let $u(t, u_0)$, be the solution with initial value $u(t_0) = u_0 \in X^{\eta_0}$, defined for $t_0 < t < T$. Then $u(t, u_0) \in X^{1+\beta} \subset H^1(\Omega)$, for $t_0 < t < T$. Let $t_1 \in (t_0, T)$, $u_1 = u(t_1, u_0)$. Then the solution $v(t, u_1)$, $v(t_1) = u_1$ of (29), with $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$ is defined for $t \in (t_1, \infty)$. Since $v(t, u_1)$ is also a solution of (29) with $\eta = \eta_0$, it must coincide with $u(t, u_0)$, for $t \in (t_1, T)$. Define $\widetilde{u}$ in $0 < t < \infty$, by $\widetilde{u}(t) = u(t, u_0)$, if $t_0 < t < T$ and $\widetilde{u}(t) = v(t, u_0)$, if $t_1 < t < \infty$. Then $\widetilde{u}$ is a solution of (29) with $\eta = \eta_0$ in (t_0, ∞).

Finally, suppose that $\eta = \eta_0 > \frac{1}{2}$, and let $u(t, u_0)$, be the solution with initial value $u(t_0) = u_0 \in X^{\eta_0}$, defined for $t_0 < t < T$ and $v(t, u_0)$, the solution of (29), with $\eta = 1$ and $v(t_0) = u_0$ defined for $t \in (t_0, \infty)$. Since $u(t, u_0)$ and $v(t, u_0)$ are both solutions of (29), with $\eta = 1$, they must coincide in (t_0, T). Since $v(t, u_0) \in X^{\eta_0}$, for $t > 0$, it is a global solution of (29) with $\eta = \eta_0$ in (t_0, ∞). □

From now on, we denote the flow generated by (29) by $T_{\eta,\beta}(t, t_0, u)$ or $T_{\eta,\beta}(t, u)$ and also sometimes do not include the parameters η and β to simplify the notation.

7. Existence of global attractors

In this section, we prove that the flow $T_{\epsilon,\eta,\beta}(t, t_0, u)$ admits a global attractor. As in the previous section, it is convenient to start with the especial case $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$.

Lemma 7.1. *If $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, the nonlinear semigroup $T_\epsilon(t)$ generated by (29), with $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$ and $-\frac{1}{2} < \beta < -\frac{1}{4}$ in $X^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega)$ is a gradient flow.*

Proof. We know, from Lemma 6.4 that the map V_ϵ defined by (40) is a Lyapunov functional for the flow. Since $(A_\epsilon)_\beta$ has compact resolvent and $(H_\epsilon)_\beta$ takes bounded subsets of $H^1(\Omega)$, into bounded subsets of X^β, it follows from Theorem 1.27 that bounded positive orbits are precompact, so $T_\epsilon(t)$ is gradient. □

We now want to show that the set of equilibria of (29) is bounded. As in the previous sections, it is convenient to prove this first for the problem in the perturbed domain.

Lemma 7.2. *Suppose that f and g satisfy the conditions of Theorem 5.5 and the dissipative conditions (37) and (38). Then if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, the set E_ϵ of equilibria of the system generated by (39) is uniformly bounded in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$.*

Proof. The equilibria of (39) are the solutions of the problem:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(x) - a u(x) + f(u(x)) &= 0\,, \quad x \in \Omega_\epsilon \\ \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial N}(x) &= g(u(x))\,,\ x \in \partial\Omega_\epsilon\,. \end{cases}$$

Multiplying by u and integrating, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} u\Delta u\, dx - a\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, u\,|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} u f(u)\, dx \\ &= -\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, \nabla u\,|^2 dx + \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} u\frac{\partial u}{\partial N}\, dS - a\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\, u\,|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} u f(u)\, dx \end{aligned}$$

$$= -\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} ug(u)\, dS - a\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |u|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} uf(u)\, dx\,. \tag{41}$$

From (37), for any $\delta > 0$ there exist constants K_δ such that

$$f(u)u \le (c_0+\delta)u^2 + K_\delta \text{ and } g(u)u \le (d_0'+\delta)u^2 + K_\delta \text{ for } u \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

From (41), we then obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\nabla u|^2 dx \le -a\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |u|^2 dx + (c_0+\delta)\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} u^2\, dx + (d_0'+\delta)\int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} u^2\, dS + K_\delta(|\Omega|+|\partial\Omega|). \tag{42}$$

On the other hand, since the first eigenvalue $\lambda_0(\epsilon)$ of the problem (38) is positive, it follows that $0 < \lambda_0(\epsilon) = \inf_{u\in H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)} \dfrac{\langle -\Delta u + (a-c_0)u\,,\, u\rangle}{||\,u\,||_{L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)}}$. Thus, for all $u \in H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$, we have

$$\lambda_0(\epsilon)\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |u|^2 dx \;\le\; \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\nabla u|^2\, dx - d_0\int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} |u|^2\, dS + (a-c_0)\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |u|^2 dx\,.$$

From (42), we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_0(\epsilon)\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |u|^2 dx \;&\le\; -a\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |u|^2 dx + (c_0+\delta)\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} u^2\, dx + (d_0'+\delta)\int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} u^2\, dS + K_\delta(|\Omega|+|\partial\Omega|)\\ &\quad -d_0\int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} |u|^2\, dS + (a-c_0)\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |u|^2 dx\\ &\le\; \delta\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} u^2\, dx + (d_0'-d_0+\delta)\int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} u^2\, dS + K_\delta(|\Omega|+|\partial\Omega|).\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Choosing $\delta < \min\{\lambda_0(\epsilon), (d_o - d_0')\}$, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} u^2\, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} u^2\, dS \le \frac{K_\delta(|\Omega|+|\partial\Omega|)}{l_\delta}, \tag{44}$$

where $l_\delta = \min\{\lambda_0(\epsilon) - \delta, (d_o - d_0') - \delta\}$.

Finally, using (42) once again, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\nabla u|^2 dx \le (c_0 + d_0' + 2\delta)\frac{K_\delta(|\Omega|+|\partial\Omega|)}{l_\delta} + K_\delta(|\Omega|+|\partial\Omega|). \tag{45}$$

The claim now follows immediately from (44) and (45), observing that the constants in those estimates can be chosen uniformly in ϵ for ϵ close to 0. □

Corollary 7.3. *Suppose that f and g satisfy the conditions of Lemma 7.2. Then if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, the set E_ϵ of equilibria of the system generated by (29) is uniformly bounded in $H^1(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Since u is an equilibria of (29) if and only if $u = {h_\epsilon}^{*-1}v$, the result follows from Lemmas 2.3 and 7.2. □

We are now in a position to prove the existence of attractors in the particular case $X^\eta = X^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega)$.

Theorem 7.4. *Suppose that f and g satisfy the conditions of Theorem 5.5 with $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$, and the dissipative conditions (37) and (38). Then if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, the flow $T_\epsilon(t,u)$ generated by (29) has a global attractor $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ in $X^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega)$ for ϵ_0 sufficiently small.*

Proof. We apply Theorem 1.31. We know, from Lemma 7.1, that the flow is gradient and from Corollary 7.3, its set of equilibria is bounded, so it remains to be proved that it is asymptotically smooth. The proof follows from the regularizing properties of the flow and is by now very standard, so we omit it (see, for example Theorem 1.27). □

We now extend the previous result to other phase spaces.

Theorem 7.5. *Suppose that f and g satisfy the conditions of Theorem 5.5, and the dissipative conditions (37) and (38). Then if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, the flow $T_{\epsilon,\eta,\beta}(u)$ generated by (29) has a global attractor $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$, for in X^η, for ϵ_0 sufficiently small. Furthermore $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ does not depend on either η or β.*

Proof. Suppose first that $\eta = \eta_0 < \frac{1}{2}$.

Let B be a bounded set in X^η. We may suppose that $B = B_R$, the ball of radius R in X^η, centered at the origin. By Lemmas 5.1 and 5.3, there is a constant N, such that $\|(H_\epsilon)_\beta(u)\|_{X^\beta} < N$, for any u, with $\|u\|_{X^\eta} < 2R$. Now, let $T(t)u_0 = u(t;t_o,u_0)$ be the solution of (29) with $\eta = \eta_0$ and initial condition $u_0 \in B_R$. We may suppose also that Re $\sigma\big((A_\epsilon)_\beta\big) > w > 0$. Then, while $\|u(t;t_0,u_0)\|_{X^\eta} \le 2R$, we have, by the variation of constants formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
||\, u(t;t_0,u_0)\,||_{X^\eta} &\le ||\, e^{-(A_\epsilon)_\beta(t-t_0)}u_0\,||_{X^\eta} + \int_{t_0}^t ||\, e^{-(A_\epsilon)_\beta(t-s)}(H_\epsilon)_\beta\, u(s)\,||_{X^\eta}\, ds \\
&\le ||\, (A_\epsilon)_\beta^{\eta-\beta} e^{-(A_\epsilon)_\beta(t-t_0)}u_0\,||_{X^\beta} + \int_{t_0}^t ||\, (A_\epsilon)_\beta^{\eta-\beta} e^{-(A_\epsilon)_\beta(t-s)}(H_\epsilon)_\beta\, u(s)\,||_{X^\beta}\, ds \\
&\le \overline{C}_{\beta,\eta}(t-t_0)^{\beta-\eta}e^{-w(t-t_0)}||u_0||_{X^\beta} + NC_{\beta,\eta}\int_{t_0}^t (t-s)^{-(\eta-\beta)}e^{-w(t-s)}ds. \quad (46)
\end{aligned}$$

Let $T = \sup\{t \ge t_0 \,|\, u(s;t_0,u_0) \in B_{2R},\ \text{for all } s \le t\}$, and δ such that

$$\overline{C}_{\beta,\eta}(t-t_0)^{\beta-\eta}e^{-w(t-t_0)}||\, u_0\,||_{X^\beta} + NC_{\beta,\eta}\int_{t_0}^t (t-s)^{-(\eta-\beta)}e^{-w(t-s)}ds < 2R.$$

From (46), it follows that $T \ge \delta$, so the solutions with initial conditions in the ball of radius R in X^η remain in the ball of radius $2R$ in X^η for $0 \le t \le T$. Now, using the variation of constants formula again, we obtain, for any $0 \le t \le T$.

$$\begin{aligned}
||\, u(t;t_0,u_0)\,||_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} &\le ||\, e^{-(A_\epsilon)_\beta(t-t_0)}u_0\,||_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \int_{t_0}^t ||\, e^{-(A_\epsilon)_\beta(t-s)}(H_\epsilon)_\beta\, u(s)\,||_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}\, ds \\
&\le ||(A_\epsilon)_\beta^{\frac{1}{2}-\eta} e^{-(A_\epsilon)_\beta(t-t_0)}u_0||_{X^\eta} + \int_{t_0}^t ||\, (A_\epsilon)_\beta^{\frac{1}{2}-\beta} e^{-(A_\epsilon)_\beta(t-s)}(H_\epsilon)_\beta\, u(s)\,||_{X^\beta}\, ds \\
&\le \overline{C}_\beta(t-t_0)^{-(\frac{1}{2}-\eta)}e^{-w(t-t_0)}||u_0||_{X^\beta} + NC_\beta\int_{t_0}^t (t-s)^{-(\frac{1}{2}-\beta)}e^{-w(t-s)}ds\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $T(t)B_R$ is in a bounded set of $X^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega)$ if $0 < t \leq T$. By Theorem 7.4 the global attractor $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ of (29) with $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$ atracts $T(t)B$ in the norm of $X^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega)$. Thus $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ also attracts B in the norm of X^η. Since $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ is invariant for the flow $T(t)$, it must be the attractor (29) with $\eta = \eta_0$.

Suppose now that $\frac{1}{2} < \eta = \eta_0 < \beta + 1$.

If B be a bounded set in X^η, it is also a bounded set in $X^{\frac{1}{2}}$, so it is attracted by the the global attractor $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ of (29) with $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$ in the norm of $X^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega)$, under the flow $T_{\frac{1}{2}}(t)$ of (29) with $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$ (which coincides with the flow of (29) with $\eta = \eta_0$ in X^η). Now we prove that $T_{\frac{1}{2}}(t)$ is continuous as a map from $X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ into X^η, for $t > 0$. If $u_1, u_2 \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $u_i(t; t_0, u_i) = T_{\frac{1}{2}}(t)u_i, i = 1, 2$, we obtain from the variation of constants formula

$$
\begin{aligned}
& || \, u(t; t_0, u_1) - u(t; t_0, u_1) \, ||_{X^\eta} \\
\leq \; & || \, e^{-(A_\epsilon)_\beta (t-t_0)}(u_1 - u_2) \, ||_{X^\eta} + \int_{t_0}^{t} || \, e^{-(A_\epsilon)_\beta (t-s)}((H_\epsilon)_\beta \, (u_1(s)) - (H_\epsilon)_\beta \, (u_2(s))) \, ||_{X^\eta} \, ds \\
\leq \; & ||(A_\epsilon)_\beta^{\eta - \frac{1}{2}} e^{-(A_\epsilon)_\beta (t-t_0)}(u_1 - u_2)||_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \int_{t_0}^{t} ||(A_\epsilon)_\beta{}^{\eta - \frac{1}{2}} e^{-(A_\epsilon)_\beta (t-s)}((H_\epsilon)_\beta \, u_1(s) - (H_\epsilon)_\beta \, u_1(s)) \, ||_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} \, ds \\
\leq \; & C_\eta (t - t_0)^{\frac{1}{2} - \eta} e^{-w(t-t_0)} || \, u_1 - u_2 \, ||_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} + L_{\beta,\eta} C_{\beta,\eta} \int_{t_0}^{t} (t-s)^{\frac{1}{2} - \eta} e^{-w(t-s)} \|u_1(s) - u_2(s)\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} ds \, ,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $L_{\beta,\eta}$ is a (local) Lipschitz constant of $(H_\epsilon)_\beta$, which exists by Lemmas 5.2 and 5.4. The claimed continuity follows then from the Gronwall's inequality. Therefore, if V_δ is a small neighborhood of the attractor $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ in $X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ which contains $T_{\frac{1}{2}}(t)B = T_\eta(t)B$, then $T_{\frac{1}{2}}(1)U$ is a small neighborhood of $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ in X^η which contains $T_{\frac{1}{2}}(t+1)B = T_\eta(t+1)B$. Since $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon = T_{\frac{1}{2}}(1)\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \in X^\eta$ is invariant, it must be the attractor of T_η. □

8. Continuity of the attractors

In this section we prove that the family of attractors of (29) is continuous in X^η at $\epsilon = 0$, for $\eta < \frac{1}{2}$.

8.1. **Uppersemicontinuity.** We start by proving that the family of attractors $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ is uniformly bounded in $H^1(\Omega)$. More precisely,

Theorem 8.1. *Suppose the hypotheses of Theorem 7.5 hold. Then, the family of attractors $\{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon, \ \epsilon < \epsilon_0\}$ of (29) is uniformly bounded in $H^1(\Omega)$ for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ is bounded in L^∞ for each ϵ.*

Proof. Denote by $T_\epsilon(t)$, the flow generated by (29), and $T = T_0$. By Corollary 7.3, there is an $\epsilon_0 > 0$, such that the set E_ϵ of equilibria of (29) is in the open ball of radius r, B_r of $H^1(\Omega)$ for $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$. If $u \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon$, by Theorem 1.31, there is a t_u such that $u = T(t_u)u_0$ for some $u_0 \in B_r$. Let V_ϵ be the Lyapunov functional of (29) given by (40). We have

$$V_\epsilon(u_0) \leq K_1 \|u_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + K_2 \leq K_1 r + K_2.$$

It follows that $V_\epsilon(u_0) \leq R$, for some constant R depending only on r. Thus

$$V_\epsilon(u) \leq V_\epsilon(T(t_u)u_0) \leq V_\epsilon(u_0) \leq R.$$

From Lemma 6.4, it follows that

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{K_1}\left(V_\epsilon(u) + K_2\right),$$

for any $u \in \bigcup_{\epsilon\leq\epsilon_0} \mathcal{A}_\epsilon$, if ϵ_0 is small enough. The L^∞ estimate follows immediately from the fact that the attractors do not depend on η, and X^η is continuously embedded in L^∞, for $\eta > \frac{1}{2}$, by Theorem 1.6. □

We are now ready prove the upper semicontinuity property of the family.

Theorem 8.2. *Suppose the hypotheses of Theorem 7.5 hold with $\beta = -\frac{1}{2}$. Then the family of attractors $\{\ \mathcal{A}_\epsilon\,,\ \ 0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0\}$ of the flow $T_{\epsilon,\eta}(t,u)$, generated by (29), whose existence is guaranteed by Theorem 7.5 is uppersemicontinuous in X^η. (We observe that the conditions on η hold if $\frac{1}{2} - \delta\eta < \frac{1}{2}$, with δ sufficiently small).*

Proof. We have to check that the conditions of Theorem 1.33 hold. In fact we have

(1) We showed, during the proof of Theorem 3.9 (see estimate (27)), that the family of operators $A_\epsilon = (A_\epsilon)_{-\frac{1}{2}}$ defined in $X^{-\frac{1}{2}} = H^{-1}(\Omega)$ with domain $X^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega)$ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.23.
(2) From Lemmas 5.1 and 5.3, it follows that $H_\epsilon = F_\epsilon + G_\epsilon$ takes bounded sets in X^η into bounded sets of $X^{-\frac{1}{2}} = H^{-1}(\Omega)$.
(3) From Lemmas 5.2 and 5.4, H_ϵ is continuous in ϵ, uniformly for u in bounded sets of X^η and locally Lipschitz in u, uniformly in ϵ.
(4) By Theorem 8.1, the set $\bigcup_{\epsilon\leq\epsilon_0} \mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ is bounded in $X^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega)$ and thus by (2) H_ϵ takes bounded sets in $X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ into bounded sets of $X^{-\frac{1}{2}} = H^{-1}(\Omega)$.

Therefore, the upper semicontinuity follows from Theorem 1.33. □

From the semicontinuity of attractors, we can easily prove the corresponding property for the equilibria.

Corollary 8.3. *Suppose the hypotheses of Theorem 7.5 hold with $\beta = -\frac{1}{2}$. Then the family of sets of equilibria $\{E_\epsilon \,|\, 0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0\}$, of the problem (29) is uppersemicontinuous in X^η.*

Proof. The result is well-known, but we sketch a proof here for completeness. Suppose u_n, with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \epsilon_n = 0$. We choose an arbitrary subsequence and still call it (u_n), for simplicity. It is enough to show that, there exists a subsequence (u_{n_k}), which converges to a point $u_0 \in E_0$. Since $(u_n) \to \mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ and $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ is compact, there exists a subsequence (u_{n_k}), which converges to a point $u_0 \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon$. Now, since the flow $T_\epsilon(t)$ is continuous in ϵ we have, for any $t > 0$

$$u_{n_k} \to u_0 \Leftrightarrow T_{\epsilon_{n_k}}(t)u_{n_k} \to T_0(t)u_0 \Leftrightarrow u_{n_k} \to T_0(t)u_0,$$

so by uniqueness of the limit $T_0(t)u_0 = u_0$, for any $t > 0$, so $u_0 \in E_0$. □

8.2. **Lowersemicontinuity.** For the lower semicontinuity we will need to assume additional properties for the nonlinearities.

$$f \text{ and } g \text{ are in } C^1(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}) \text{ with bounded derivatives .} \tag{47}$$

Lemma 8.4. *If f satisfies (47) and $\eta > 0$ then the operator $F : X^\eta \times \mathbb{R} \to X^\beta$ given by (31) is Gateaux differentiable with respect to u, with Gateaux differential $\dfrac{\partial F}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)w$ given by*

$$\left\langle \frac{\partial F}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)w\,,\,\Phi \right\rangle_{\beta,-\beta} = \int_\Omega f^{'}(u)w\,\Phi\,dx\,, \tag{48}$$

for all $w \in X^\eta$ and $\Phi \in X^{-\beta}$.

Proof. Observe first that $F(u,\epsilon)$ is well-defined, since the conditions of Lemma 5.1 are met, with $\lambda_1 = 0$.

It is clear that $\dfrac{\partial F}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)$ is linear. We now show that it is bounded. In fact we have, for all $u, w \in X^\eta$ and $\Phi \in X^{-\beta}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\left\langle \frac{\partial F}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)w\,,\,\Phi \right\rangle_{\beta,-\beta}\right| &\leq \int_\Omega |\, f^{'}(u)\,|\,|\,w\,|\,|\,\Phi\,|\,dx \\
&\leq \|\, f'\,\|_\infty \int_\Omega |\,w\,|\,|\,\Phi\,|\,dx \\
&\leq \|\, f'\,\|_\infty \|\,w\,\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\,\|\,\Phi\,\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\,dx \\
&\leq \|\, f'\,\|_\infty K_1K_3\|w\|_{X^\eta}\,\|\,\Phi\,\|_{X^{-\beta}}\,dx\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\|f'\|_\infty = \sup\{f'(x)\,|\,x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and K_1, K_3 are embedding constants. This proves boundeness.

Now, we have, for all $u, w \in X^\eta$ and $\Phi \in X^{-\beta}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\frac{1}{t}\left\langle F(u+tw,\epsilon) - F(u,\epsilon) - t\frac{\partial F}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)w, \Phi \right\rangle_{\beta,-\beta}\right| \\
\leq\ & \frac{1}{|t|}\int_\Omega \left|\,[\,f(u+tw) - f(u) - tf^{'}(u)w\,]\,\Phi\,\right| dx \\
\leq\ & K_1\frac{1}{|t|}\left(\int_\Omega \left|f(u+tw) - f(u) - tf^{'}(u)w\right|^2 dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ||\Phi||_{X^{-\beta}} \\
\leq\ & K_1\left(\underbrace{\int_\Omega \left|\,\left(f'(u+\bar{t}w) - f^{'}(u)\right)w\,\right|^2 dx}_{(I)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ||\,\Phi\,||_{X^{-\beta}},
\end{aligned}$$

where K_1 is the embedding constant of $X^{-\beta}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, and $0 \leq \bar{t} \leq t$. Since f' is bounded, the integrand of (I) is bounded by an integrable function and goes to 0 as $t \to 0$. Thus, the integral (I) goes to 0 as $t \to 0$, from Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem.

It follows that $\lim_{t\to 0}\dfrac{F(u+tw,\epsilon)-F(u,\epsilon)}{t}=\dfrac{\partial F}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)w$ in X^β, for all $u,w\in X^\eta$; so F is Gateaux differentiable with Gateaux differential given by (48). □

We now want to prove that the Gateaux differential of $F(u,\epsilon)$ is continuous in u. Let us denote by $\mathcal{B}(X,Y)$ the space of linear bounded operators from X to Y. We will need the following result, whose simple proof is omitted.

Lemma 8.5. *Suppose X,Y are Banach spaces and $T_n : X\to Y$ is a sequence of linear operators converging strongly to the linear operator $T : X\to Y$. Suppose also that $X_1\subset X$ is a Banach space, the inclusion $i : X_1\hookrightarrow X$ is compact and let $\widetilde{T}_n = T_n\circ i$ and $\widetilde{T} = T\circ i$. Then $\widetilde{T}_n\to\widetilde{T}$ uniformly for x in a bounded subset of X_1 (that is, in the or norm of $\mathcal{B}(X_1,Y)$).*

Lemma 8.6. *If f satisfies (47) and $\eta>0$ then the Gateaux differential of $F(u,\epsilon)$, with respect to u is continuous in u, that is, the map $u\mapsto\dfrac{\partial F}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)\in\mathcal{B}(X^\eta,X^\beta)$ is continuous.*

Proof. Let u_n be a sequence converging to u em X^η, and choose $0<\widetilde{\eta}<\eta$. Then, we have for any $\Phi\in X^{-\beta}$ and $w\in X^{\widetilde{\eta}}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left\langle\left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial u}(u_n,\epsilon)-\frac{\partial F}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)\right)w\,,\,\Phi\right\rangle_{\beta\,,\,-\beta}\right| &\le \int_\Omega\left|\,\big(\,f^{'}(u)-f^{'}(u_n)\,\big)w\,\Phi\,\right|dx\\ &\le \left(\int_\Omega\big|\big(f^{'}(u)-f^{'}(u_n)\big)w\big|^2dx\right)^{\frac12}\left(\int_\Omega|\Phi|^2dx\right)^{\frac12}\\ &\le K_1\Big(\underbrace{\int_\Omega\big|\big(f^{'}(u)-f^{'}(u_n)\big)w\big|^2dx}_{(I)}\Big)^{\frac12}||\Phi||_{X^{-\beta}}\,,\end{aligned}$$

where K_1 is the embedding constant of $X^{-\beta}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$.

Now, the integrand in (I) is bounded by the integrable function $||\,f^{'}||_\infty^2\,w^{\,2}$ and goes to 0 a.e. as $u_n\to u$ in X^η. Therefore the sequence of operators $\dfrac{\partial F}{\partial u}(u_n,\epsilon)$ converges strongly in the space $\mathcal{B}(X^{\widetilde{\eta}},X^\beta)$ to the operator $\dfrac{\partial F}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)$. From Lemma 8.5 the convergence holds in the norm of $\mathcal{B}(X^\eta,X^\beta)$, since X^η is compactly embedded in $X^{\widetilde{\eta}}$, by Theorem 1.20. □

Lemma 8.7. *If g satisfies (47) and $\eta>\frac14$ then the operator $G : X^\eta\times\mathbb{R}\to X^\beta$ given by (32) is Gateaux differentiable with respect to u, with Gateaux differential*

$$\left\langle\frac{\partial G}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)w\,,\,\Phi\right\rangle_{\beta,-\beta}=\int_{\partial\Omega}g^{'}(\gamma(u))\gamma(w)\,\gamma(\Phi)\,\left|\frac{J_{\partial\Omega}h_\epsilon}{Jh_\epsilon}\right|\,d\sigma(x)\,,\tag{49}$$

for all $w\in X^\eta$ and $\Phi\in X^{-\beta}$.

Proof. Observe first that $G(u,\epsilon)$ is well-defined, since the conditions of Lemma 5.3 are met, with $\lambda_2=0$.

It is clear that $\dfrac{\partial G}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)$ is linear. We now show that it is bounded. In fact we have, for all $u, w \in X^\eta$ and $\Phi \in X^{-\beta}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\left\langle \frac{\partial G}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)w\,,\,\Phi\right\rangle_{\beta,-\beta}\right| &= \left|\int_{\partial\Omega} g^{'}(\gamma(u))\gamma(w)\,\gamma(\Phi)\,\left|\frac{J_{\partial\Omega}h_\epsilon}{Jh_\epsilon}\right|\,d\sigma(x)\right| \\
&\leq \|\theta\|_\infty\,\|g'\|_\infty\int_{\partial\Omega}|\gamma(w)|\,|\gamma(\Phi)|\,d\sigma(x) \\
&\leq \|\theta\|_\infty\,\|g'\|_\infty\|\gamma(w)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}\,\|\,\gamma(\Phi)\,\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\
&\leq K_1K_2\|\theta\|_\infty\,\|g'\|_\infty\|w\|_{X^\eta}\,\|\,\Phi\,\|_{X^{-\beta}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\|g'\|_\infty = \sup\{g'(x)\,|\,x\in\mathbb{R}\}$, $\|\theta\|_\infty = \sup\{|\theta(x,\epsilon)|\,|\,x\in\partial\Omega\} = \sup\left\{\dfrac{J_{\partial\Omega}h_\epsilon}{Jh_\epsilon}(x)\,\middle|\,x\in\partial\Omega\right\}$ and K_1, K_2 are embedding constants given by Theorems 1.21 and 1.10. This proves boundeness.

Now, we have, for all $u, w \in X^\eta$ and $\Phi \in X^{-\beta}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\frac{1}{t}\left\langle G(u+tw,\epsilon)-G(u,\epsilon)-t\frac{\partial G}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)w\,,\,\Phi\right\rangle_{\beta,-\beta}\right| \\
\leq\ & \frac{1}{|t|}\int_{\partial\Omega}|\,[\,g(\gamma(u+tw))-g(\gamma(u))-tg'(\gamma(u))]\,\gamma(w)\,|\,\,|\gamma(\Phi)|\,\left|\frac{J_{\partial\Omega}h_\epsilon}{Jh_\epsilon}\right|\,d\sigma(x) \\
\leq\ & K_1\|\theta\|_\infty\frac{1}{|t|}\left\{\int_{\partial\Omega}|\,[\,g(\gamma(u+tw))-g(\gamma(u))-tg'(\gamma(u))\,]\,\gamma(w)|\,\,d\sigma(x)\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Phi\|_{X^{-\beta}} \\
\leq\ & K_1\|\theta\|_\infty\left\{\underbrace{\int_{\partial\Omega}|\,[\,g'(\gamma(u+\bar{t}w))-g'(\gamma(u))\,]\,\gamma(w)\,|\,\,d\sigma(x)}_{(I)}\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Phi\|_{X^{-\beta}},
\end{aligned}$$

where K_1 is the embedding constant given by Theorems 1.21 and 1.10, and $0\leq\bar{t}\leq t$. Since g' is bounded, the integrand of (I) is bounded by an integrable function and goes to 0 as $t\to 0$. Thus, the integral (I) goes to 0 as $t\to 0$, from Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem. It follows that $\lim\limits_{t\to 0}\dfrac{G(u+tw,\epsilon)-G(u,\epsilon)}{t} = \dfrac{\partial G}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)w$ in X^β, for all $u, w\in X^\eta$; so G is Gateaux differentiable with Gateaux differential given by (49). □

Lemma 8.8. *If g satisfies (47) and $\eta > \frac{1}{4}$ then the Gateaux differential of $G(u,\epsilon)$, with respect to u is continuous in u (that is, the map $u\mapsto\dfrac{\partial G}{\partial u}(u,\epsilon)\in\mathcal{B}(X^\eta,X^\beta)$ is continuous) and uniformly continuous in ϵ for u in bounded sets of X^η and $0\leq\epsilon\leq\epsilon_0<1$.*

Proof. Let $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, u_n be a sequence converging to u em X^η, and choose $\frac{1}{4} < \widetilde{\eta} < \eta$. Then, we have for any $\Phi \in X^{-\beta}$ and $w \in X^{\widetilde{\eta}}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \left\langle \left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial u}(u_n, \epsilon) - \frac{\partial G}{\partial u}(u, \epsilon) \right) w \, , \, \Phi \right\rangle_{\beta \, , -\beta} \right| \\
\leq & \int_{\partial\Omega} |(g'(\gamma(u)) - g'(\gamma(u_n)))\, \gamma(w)\, \gamma(\Phi)| \left| \frac{J_{\partial\Omega} h_\epsilon}{J h_\epsilon} \right| d\sigma(x) \\
\leq & \|\theta_\epsilon\|_\infty \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} |(g'(\gamma(u)) - g'(\gamma(u_n))\gamma(w)\ |^2 \, d\sigma(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} |\, \gamma(\Phi)\, |^2 \, d\sigma(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\leq & K\|\theta_\epsilon\|_\infty \left\{ \underbrace{\int_{\partial\Omega} |(g'(\gamma(u)) - g'(\gamma(u_n))\gamma(w)\ |^2 \, d\sigma(x)}_{(I)} \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Phi\|_{X^{-\beta}} \, ,
\end{aligned}$$

where K is the constant due to continuity of the trace map from $X^{-\beta}$ into $L^2(\partial\Omega)$.

Now, the integrand in (I) is bounded by the integrable function $4||\, g'\, ||^2_\infty \, |\gamma(w)|^2$ and goes to 0 a.e. as $u_n \to u$ in X^η, by Theorems 1.21 and 1.10. Therefore the sequence of operators $\dfrac{\partial G}{\partial u}(u_n, \epsilon)$ converges strongly in the space $\mathcal{B}(X^{\widetilde{\eta}}, X^\beta)$ to the operator $\dfrac{\partial G}{\partial u}(u, \epsilon)$. From Lemma 8.5 the convergence holds in the norm of $\mathcal{B}(X^\eta, X^\beta)$, since X^η is compactly embedded in $X^{\widetilde{\eta}}$, by Theorem 1.20.

On the other hand, if $0 \leq \epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_2 < \epsilon_0$, we have for any $\Phi \in X^{-\beta}$ and $w \in X^\eta$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \left\langle \left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial u}(u, \epsilon_1) - \frac{\partial G}{\partial u}(u, \epsilon_2) \right) w \, , \, \Phi \right\rangle_{\beta \, , -\beta} \right| \\
\leq & \int_{\partial\Omega} |\, g'(\gamma(u))\gamma(w)\, \gamma(\Phi)\, |\ |\theta_{\epsilon_1} - \theta_{\epsilon_2}|\ d\sigma(x) \, , \\
\leq & \|\theta_{\epsilon_1} - \theta_{\epsilon_2}\|_\infty \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} |g'(\gamma(u))\gamma(w)\ |^2 \, d\sigma(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} |\, \gamma(\Phi)\, |^2 \, d\sigma(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\leq & KK' \| \, g' \, \|_\infty \| \, w \, \|_{X^\eta} \|\Phi\|_{X^{-\beta}} \|\theta_{\epsilon_1} - \theta_{\epsilon_2}\|_\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where K' is the constant due to continuity of the trace map from X^η into $L^2(\partial\Omega)$. This proves uniform continuity in ϵ. □

Lemma 8.9. *If f and g satisfy the condition (47) and $\eta > \frac{1}{4}$, then the map $(H_\epsilon)_\beta = (F_\epsilon)_\beta + (G_\epsilon)_\beta : X^\eta \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto X^\beta$ given by (30) is continuously Fréchet differentiable with respect to u and the derivative $\dfrac{\partial G}{\partial u}$ is uniformly continuous with respect to ϵ, for u in bounded sets of X^η and $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0 < 1$.*

Proof. The proof follows from Lemmas 8.6, 8.8 and Proposition 2.8 in [13]. □

We now prove lower semicontinuity for the equilibria.

Theorem 8.10. *If f and g satisfy the conditions of Theorem 7.5 and also (47), the equilibria of (29) with $\epsilon = 0$ are all hyperbolic and $\frac{1}{4} < \eta < \frac{1}{2}$, then the family of sets of equilibria $\{E_\epsilon \,|\, 0 \leq \epsilon < \epsilon_0\}$ of (29) is lower semicontinuous in X^η at $\epsilon = 0$.*

Proof. A point $e \in X^\eta$ is an equilibrium of (29) if and only if it is a root of the map

$$\begin{array}{rcl} Z : H^1(\Omega) \times \mathbb{R} & \longrightarrow & X^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ (u\,,\,\epsilon) & \longmapsto & (A_\epsilon)_{-\frac{1}{2}}(u) + (H_\epsilon)_{-\frac{1}{2}}(u)\,, \end{array}$$

By Lemma 8.9 the map $(H_\epsilon)_{-\frac{1}{2}} : X^\eta \to X^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is continuously Fréchet differentiable with respect to u and by Lemmas 5.4 and 5.2 it is also continuous in ϵ if $\eta = \frac{1}{2} - \delta$, with $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently small. Therefore, the same holds if $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$.

The map $A_\epsilon = -h_\epsilon^* \Delta_{\Omega_\epsilon} h_\epsilon^* + aI$ is a bounded linear operator from $H^1(\Omega)$ to $X^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. It is also continuous in ϵ since it is analytic as a function of $h_\epsilon \in Diff^1(\Omega)$ and h_ϵ is continuous in ϵ.

Thus, the map Z is continuously differentiable in u and continuous in ϵ. The derivative of $\dfrac{\partial Z}{\partial u}(e, 0)$ is an isomorphism by hypotheses. Therefore, the Implicit Function Theorem apply, implying that the zeroes of $Z(\cdot, \epsilon)$ are given by a continuous function $e(\epsilon)$. This proves the claim. □

For to prove the lower semi continuity, we also need to prove the continuity of local unstable manifolds at equilibria, more precisely

Theorem 8.11. *Suppose f and g satisfy the conditions of Theorem 8.10, u_0 is an equilibrium of (29) with $\epsilon = 0$, and for each $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, let u_ϵ be the unique equilibrium of (29), whose existence is asserted by Corollary 8.3 and Theorem 8.10. Then, for ϵ and δ sufficiently small, there exists a local unstable manifold $W^u_{\rm loc}(u_\epsilon)$ of u_ϵ, and if we denote $W^u_\delta(u_\epsilon) = \{w \in W^u_{\rm loc}(u_\epsilon) \mid \|w - u_\epsilon\|_{X^\eta} < \delta\}$, then*

$$\beta\Big(W^u_\delta(u_\epsilon), W^u_\delta(u_0)\Big) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta\Big(W^u_\delta(u_0), W^u_\delta(u_\epsilon)\Big)$$

approach zero as $\epsilon \to 0$, where $\beta(O, Q) = \sup\limits_{o \in O} \inf\limits_{q \in Q} \|q - o\|_{X^\eta}$ for O, $Q \subset X^\eta$.

Proof. Let $H_\epsilon(u) = H(u, \epsilon)$ be the map defined by (30), with $\beta = -\frac{1}{2}$ and u_ϵ a hyperbolic equilibrium of (29). Since $H(u, \epsilon)$ is differentiable by Lemma 8.9, it follows that $H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon + w, \epsilon) = H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon, \epsilon) + H_u(u_\epsilon, \epsilon)w + r(w, \epsilon) = A_\epsilon u_\epsilon + H_u(u_\epsilon, \epsilon)w + r(w, \epsilon)$, with $r(w, \epsilon) = o(\|w\|_{X^\eta})$, as $\|w\|_{X^\eta} \to 0$. The claimed result was proved in [12], assuming the following properties of H_ϵ:

a) $||\, r(w, 0) - r(w, \epsilon)\,||_{X^\beta} \leq C(\epsilon)$, with $C(\epsilon) \to 0$ when $\epsilon \to 0$, uniformly for w in a neighborhood of 0 in X^η.

b) $||\, r(w_1, \epsilon) - r(w_2, \epsilon)\,||_{X^\beta} \leq k(\rho)||\, w_1 - w_2\,||_{X^\eta}$, for $||\, w_1\,||_{X^\eta} \leq \rho$, $||\, w_2\,||_{X^\eta} \leq \rho$, with $k(\rho) \to 0$ when $\rho \to 0^+$ and $k(*)$ is non decreasing.

Property a) follows from easily from the fact that both $H(u, \epsilon)$ and $H_u(u, \epsilon)$ are uniformly continuous in ϵ for u in bounded sets of X^η, by Lemmas 5.4, 5.2 and 8.9. It remains to prove property b).

If $w_1, w_2 \in X^\eta$ and $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$, with $0 < \epsilon_0 < 1$ small enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} || \, r(w_1 \, , \, \epsilon) - r(w_2 \, , \, \epsilon) \, ||_{X^\beta} &= || \, H(u_\epsilon + w_1 \, , \, \epsilon) - H(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) - H_u(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) w_1 \\ &\quad - H(u_\epsilon + w_2 \, , \, \epsilon) + H_\epsilon(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) + H_u(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) w_2 \, ||_{X^\beta} \\ &\leq || \, F(u_\epsilon + w_1 \, , \, \epsilon) - F(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) - F_u(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) w_1 \qquad (50) \\ &\quad - F(u_\epsilon + w_2 \, , \, \epsilon) + F(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) + F_u(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) w_2 \, ||_{X^\beta} \\ &\quad + || \, G(u_\epsilon + w_1 \, , \, \epsilon) - G(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) - G_u(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) w_1 \qquad (51) \\ &\quad - G(u_\epsilon + w_2 \, , \, \epsilon) + G(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) + G_u(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) w_2 \, ||_{X^\beta} \, . \end{aligned}$$

We first estimate (50). Since f' is bounded by (47), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big| \, \langle \, F(u_\epsilon + w_1 \, , \, \epsilon) - F(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) - F_u(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) w_1 \\ &\quad - F(u_\epsilon + w_2 \, , \, \epsilon) + F(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) + F_u(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) w_2 \, , \, \Phi \, \rangle_{\beta, -\beta} \, \Big| \\ \leq \; & \int_\Omega | \, [\, f(u_\epsilon + w_1) - f(u_\epsilon) - f'(u_\epsilon) w_1 - f(u_\epsilon + w_2) + f(u_\epsilon) + f'(u_\epsilon) w_2 \,] \, \Phi \, | \, dx \\ = \; & \int_\Omega | \, [\, f'(u_\epsilon + \xi_x) - f'(u_\epsilon) \,] (w_1(x) - w_2(x)) \, \Phi \, | \, dx \\ \leq \; & K_2 \left\{ \int_\Omega \Big| \, [\, f'(u_\epsilon + \xi_x) - f'(u_\epsilon) \,]^2 (w_1(x) - w_2(x))^2 \, \Big| \, dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \| \Phi \|_{H^1(\Omega)} \, , \end{aligned}$$

where K_2 is the embedding constant of $X^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega)$ into $L^2(\Omega)$, and $w_1(x) \leq \xi_x \leq w_2(x)$ or $w_2(x) \leq \xi_x \leq w_1(x)$.

Now choosing $q = \dfrac{1}{1 - 2\eta}$, we have by Theorems 1.5 and 1.21 that X^η is continuously embedded in $L^{2q}(\Omega)$ Therefore, if p is the conjugate exponent of q we have, by Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \int_\Omega [\, f'(u_\epsilon + \xi_x) - f'(u_\epsilon) \,]^{\, 2} (w_1(x) - w_2(x))^{\, 2} dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leq \; & \left\{ \int_\Omega [\, f'(u_\epsilon + \xi_x) - f'(u_\epsilon) \,]^{\, 2p} dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2p}} \left\{ \int_\Omega (w_1(x) - w_2(x))^{\, 2q} dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\ \leq \; & \left\{ \int_\Omega [\, f'(u_\epsilon + \xi_x) - f'(u_\epsilon) \,]^{\, 2p} dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2p}} || \, w_1 - w_2 \, ||_{L^{2q}(\Omega)} \\ \leq \; & K_3 \left\{ \int_\Omega [\, f'(u_\epsilon + \xi_x) - f'(u_\epsilon) \,]^{\, 2p} dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2p}} || \, w_1 - w_2 \, ||_{X^\eta} \, , \end{aligned}$$

where K_3 is the embedding constant of the embedding X^η into $L^{2q}(\Omega)$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & || F(u_\epsilon + w_1, \epsilon) - F(u_\epsilon, \epsilon) - F_u(u_\epsilon, \epsilon)w_1 - F(u_\epsilon + w_2, \epsilon) + F(u_\epsilon, \epsilon) + F_u(u_\epsilon, \epsilon)w_2||_{X^\beta} \\ \leq \;& K_2 K_3 \left\{ \int_\Omega [\, f'(u_\epsilon + \xi_x) - f'(u_\epsilon)\,]^{2p} dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2p}} || \, w_1 - w_2 \, ||_{X^\eta} \, . \end{aligned}$$

Now the integrand above is bounded by $4^p ||f'||_\infty^{2p}$ and goes a.e. to 0 as $\rho \to 0$, since $|| \, w_1 \, ||_{X^\eta} \leq \rho$, $|| \, w_2 \, ||_{X^\eta} \leq \rho$ and $w_1(x) \leq \xi_x \leq w_2(x)$. Thus, the integral goes to 0 by Lebesgue's bounded convergence Theorem.

We now estimate (51):

$$\begin{aligned} & \Big| \, \langle G(u_\epsilon + w_1 \, , \, \epsilon) - G(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) - G_u(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon)w_1 \\ & -G(u_\epsilon + w_2 \, , \, \epsilon) + G(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) + G_u(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon)w_2 \, , \, \Phi \, \rangle_{\beta,-\beta} \, \Big| \\ \leq \;& \int_{\partial\Omega} \Big| \, [\, g(\gamma(u_\epsilon + w_1)) - g(\gamma(u_\epsilon)) - g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon))w_1 \\ & -g(\gamma(u_\epsilon + w_2)) + g(\gamma(u_\epsilon)) + g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon))w_2 \,] \, \gamma(\Phi)\gamma\left(\left| \frac{J_{\partial\Omega} h_\epsilon}{J h_\epsilon} \right| \right) \Big| \, d\sigma(x) \\ = \;& \int_{\partial\Omega} \left| \, [\, g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon + \xi_x)) - g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon)) \,]\gamma(\, w_1(x) - w_2(x) \,) \, \gamma(\Phi)\gamma\left(\left| \frac{J_{\partial\Omega} h_\epsilon}{J h_\epsilon} \right| \right) \right| d\sigma(x) \\ \leq \;& \overline{K}_2 \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} [\, (g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon + \xi_x)) - g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon)))\,]^2 [\gamma(w_1(x) - w_2(x))]^2 \left[\gamma\left(\left| \frac{J_{\partial\Omega} h_\epsilon}{J h_\epsilon} \right| \right) \right] d\sigma(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} ||\Phi||_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} \, , \end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{K}_2$ is the constant of the embedding $X^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega)$ into $L^2(\partial\Omega)$ given by Theorem 1.10, and $w_1(x) \leq \xi_x \leq w_2(x)$ or $w_2(x) \leq \xi_x \leq w_1(x)$. Now choosing $\overline{q} = \dfrac{1}{1-2\eta}$, we have by Theorems 1.10 and 1.21 that X^η is continuously embedded in $L^{2\overline{q}}(\partial\Omega)$. Therefore, if $\overline{p}$ is the conjugate exponent of $\overline{q}$ we have, by Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} [\, g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon + \xi_x)) - g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon))]^2 [\, \gamma(w_1(x) - w_2(x))\,]^2 \left[\gamma\left(\left| \frac{J_{\partial\Omega} h_\epsilon}{J h_\epsilon} \right| \right) \right]^2 d\sigma(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leq \;& \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} [\, g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon + \xi_x)) - g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon))]^{2\overline{p}} \left[\gamma\left(\left| \frac{J_{\partial\Omega} h_\epsilon}{J h_\epsilon} \right| \right) \right]^{2\overline{p}} d\sigma(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2\overline{p}}} \\ & \cdot \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} [\gamma(w_1(x) - w_2(x))]^{2\overline{q}} d\sigma(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2\overline{q}}} \\ \leq \;& \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} [g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon + \xi_x)) - g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon))]^{2\overline{p}} \left[\gamma\left(\left| \frac{J_{\partial\Omega} h_\epsilon}{J h_\epsilon} \right| \right) \right]^{2\overline{p}} d\sigma(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2\overline{p}}} || \, w_1 - w_2 \, ||_{L^{2\overline{q}}(\partial\Omega)} \\ \leq \;& \overline{K}_3 \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} [\, g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon + \xi_x)) - g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon))]^{2\overline{p}} \left[\gamma\left(\left| \frac{J_{\partial\Omega} h_\epsilon}{J h_\epsilon} \right| \right) \right]^{2\overline{p}} d\sigma(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2\overline{p}}} || \, w_1 - w_2 \, ||_{X^\eta} \, , \end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{K}_3$ is the embedding constant of X^η into $L^{2\overline{q}}(\partial\Omega)$. Therefore, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|| \, G(u_\epsilon + w_1 \, , \, \epsilon) - G(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) - G_u(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) w_1 - \, G(u_\epsilon + w_2 \, , \, \epsilon) + G(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) + G_u(u_\epsilon \, , \, \epsilon) w_2 \, ||_{X^\beta} \\
\leq \quad & \overline{K}_2 \, \overline{K}_3 \left\{ \int_{\partial\Omega} [\, g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon + \xi_x)) - g'(\gamma(u_\epsilon))]^{2\overline{p}} \left[\gamma \left(\left| \frac{J_{\partial\Omega} h_\epsilon}{J h_\epsilon} \right| \right) \right]^{2\overline{p}} d\sigma(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2\overline{p}}} || \, w_1 - w_2 \, ||_{X^\eta} \, .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now the integrand above is bounded by $4^{\overline{p}} || \, g' \, ||_\infty^{2\overline{p}} || \, \theta \, ||_\infty^{2\overline{p}}$, where θ is the bounded function given by (35) and (36), and goes to 0 a.e. as $\rho \to 0$, since $|| \, w_1 \, ||_{X^\eta} \leq \rho$, $|| \, w_2 \, ||_{X^\eta} \leq \rho$ and $w_1(x) \leq \xi_x \leq w_2(x)$. Thus, the integral goes to 0 by Lebesgue's dominated convergence Theorem. □

We are now in a position to prove the main result of this section

Theorem 8.12. *Assume the hypotheses of Theorem 8.10 hold. Then the family of attractors* $\{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \, | \, 0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0\}$*, of the problem (29), whose existence is guaranteed by Theorem 7.5 is lower semicontinuous in* X^η*. (We observe that the conditions on* η *hold if* $\frac{1}{2} - \delta\eta < \frac{1}{2}$*, with* δ *sufficiently small.)*

Proof.

The system generated by (29) is gradient for any ϵ and its equilibria are all hyperbolic for ϵ in a neighborhood of 0. Also, the equilibria are continuous in ϵ by Theorem 8.10, the linearization is continuous in ϵ as shown during the proof of Theorem 8.10 and the local unstable manifolds of the equilibria are continuous in ϵ, by Theorem 8.11. The result follows then from Theorem 1.34. □

References

[1] Arrieta,J.M. and Bruschi,S.M., *Rapidly varying boundaries in equations with nonlinear boundary conditions. The case of a Lipschitz deformation*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, vol. 17, number 10, (2007).

[2] Arrieta,J.M. and Bruschi,S.M., *Very rapidly varying boundaries in equations with nonlinear boundary conditions. The case of a non uniformly Lipschitz deformation*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems Serie B, vol. 14, number 2, (2010).

[3] Arrieta, J.M. and Carvalho, A.N.,*Spectral convergence and nonlinear dynamics of reaction-diffusion equations under perturbations of the domain*, J. Differential Equations 199 (2004) 143-178.

[4] Carvalho, A.N., Oliva, S.M., Pereira, A.L. and Bernal, A.R., *Parabolic problems with nonlinear boundary conditions*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 207, 409-461 (1997).

[5] Grisvard, P., *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*, Classics in Applied Mathematics, SIAM, 69.

[6] Hale, J. K., *Asymptotic behavior of dissipative systems*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, number 25, American Mathematical Society.

[7] Henry, D.B., *Perturbation of the boundary in boundary-value problems of partial differential equations*, Cambrigde Univ. Press, 2005.

[8] Henry, D.B., *Geometric theory of semilinear parabolic equations*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 840, Springer-Verlag, 1981.

[9] Nečas, J., *Direct methods in the theory of elliptic equations*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, 2012.

[10] Oliva, S. M. and Pereira, A. L., *Attractors for parabolic problems with nonlinear boundary conditions in fractional power spaces*, Dyn. Contin. Discrete Impuls. Syst. Ser. A. Math. Anal. 9 (2002) 551-562.

[11] Oliveira, L.A.F., Pereira, A. L. and Pereira, M. C., *Continuity of attractors for a reaction-diffusion problem with respect to variations of the domain*, Electron. J. Differential Equations 2005 (100) (2005) 1-18.
[12] Pereira, A. L. and Pereira, M. C., *Continuity of attractors for a reaction-diffusion problem with nonlinear boundary conditions with respect to variations of the domain*, Journal of Differential Equations 239 (2007), 343-370.
[13] Rall L.B., *Nonlinear Functional Analysis and Applications*, Academic Press, 1971.
[14] Schmüdgem K., *Unbounded self-adjoint operators in Hilbert space*, Springer-Verlag, 2012.
[15] Yagi, A., *Abstract Parabolic Evolution Equations and their Applications*, Springer-Verlag, 2010.

Pricila S. Barbosa
Departamento de Matemática Aplicada, Universidad Complutense de Madrid - Madrid - Spain
E-mail address: pricila@ime.usp.br

Antônio L. Pereira
Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade de São Paulo - São Paulo - Brazil
E-mail address: alpereir@ime.usp.br

Marcone C. Pereira
Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade de São Paulo - São Paulo - Brazil
E-mail address: marcone@ime.usp.br